

COMPARATIVE VIEWS OF  
THE CONTROVERSY  
BETWEEN THE  
CALVINISTS AND THE  
ARMINIANS BY WILLIAM  
WHITE, D. D.

BISHOP OF THE  
PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL  
CHURCH IN THE  
COMMONWEALTH OF  
PENNSYLVANIA.  
IN TWO VOLUMES. VOL.  
I.

PHILADELPHIA:  
PUBLISHED BY M.  
THOMAS, 52,  
CHESTNUT-STREET.  
FROM THE PRESS OF E.  
BRONSON.  
1817.

PARISH LIBRARY  
OF THE  
FIRST CONGREGATIONAL SOCIETY,

BURLINGTON, V.T.

No. 172.

*District of Pennsylvania, to  
wit:*

BE IT REMEMBERED, that on the fifteenth day of May, in the forty-first year of the Independence of the United States of America A. D. 1817, The Reverend Jackson Kemper, the Reverend James Montgomery, John Perot, and Charles Bancker, of the said district, have deposited in this office the title of a book the right whereof they claim as proprietors in the words following, to wit:



mentioned.”— And also to the Act, entitled, “An Act supplementary to An Act, entitled, “An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the Copies of Maps, Charts, and Books, to the Authors and Proprietors of such Copies during the times therein mentioned,” and extending the benefits thereof to the Arts of designing, engraving, and etching historical and other prints.”

D. CALDWELL,  
*Clerk of the District of Pennsylvania.*



# CONTENTS OF VOL. I

## PREFACE.

## PART I.

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians, with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.*

## INTRODUCTION

The Object of the Inquiry—Mr. Locke's Plan of studying the Epistle—Unity of Design—Overlooked by Dr. Whitby and Dr.

Doddridge—The Epistle argumentative—Respects Nations, and a Covenant State—But not implying exclusive Possession of the favor of God.

## 1. OF PREDESTINATION

The Question stated—Sense of Ch. 8. v. 29, to end of Ch. 9—Of ch. 10 and 11—Connexion of the whole with Ch. 12. v. 1.

## 2. OF REDEMPTION

The Question stated—Nothing to the Purpose of the Controversy—The Sense

of the latter part of Ch. 5.

### 3. OF FREEWILL

The Meaning of the Term, as understood by both Parties—who had no difference concerning it—There arises the question of Original Sin, on which they differ—The point of difference—Sense of ch. 3. v. 9—Sense of ch. 3. v. 7, in connexion with ch. 7, from v. 7—Interpretation before Austin—and by him.

### 4. OF GRACE

The question stated—Nothing

relative—Some passages which may be thought to apply—Relation of the subject to the question concerning good works—4th ch. with resulting considerations.

## 5. OF PERSEVERANCE

Opposition of the parties—Sense of ch. 8. v. 38, 39—And of ch. 11. v. 29.

## CONCLUSION

The points agreed on—Reasons of the form of this discussion—Remarks on St Paul's epistles—And on the

epistle to the Romans in particular.

## APPENDIX.

ON THE CASE OF THE  
HEATHEN

Calvin and others on the  
subject— Calvinistick  
churches—The point of  
difference between  
Christians and the  
Heathen— Authorities  
from the Old  
Testament—The  
circumstances of  
idolatry—Authorities  
from the New Testament.

**PART 2.**

*A Comparison of the  
Controversy between the  
Calvinists and the  
Arminians, with Holy  
Scripture generally.*

INTRODUCTION

Dissent

from

Calvinism—Not

on

Arminian

principles—Origin

of

Calvinism—Its

progress—Its alliance

with

Philosophical

necessity—Difference

between this and original

Calvinism—Not in the

decrees of the Synod of

Dort—Since embraced by

various  
Calvinists—Proposal to  
exclude it from  
Theology—Result, is the  
stating of Scripture  
doctrine.

## 1. OF

### PREDESTINATION

Of the term “decree”—  
Predestination only  
incidentally found in  
other  
books—Predestination  
and Election mean the  
same in all—Phrases,  
thought similar in  
sense—The situation of  
St. Paul—Sundry passages  
of scripture—A

constructive sense—  
Useless  
questions—Rules— The  
subject being foreign to  
scripture, must be judged  
of on principles of  
reason—A point, on  
which the parties are  
agreed—A deduction,  
from what should be  
considered as the point of  
difference—The result, in  
relation to the divine  
attributes.

2. OF REDEMPTION  
Import of the  
term—Arminian side  
adopted—Texts  
expressive of

universality—Of the same, without mentioning sacrifice for sin—Texts of Invitation—Of expostulation—Of promise and threatening making especial mention of the world—Which excite to the imitation of God—Expressive of being within the covenant—Of temporal mercies—Of spiritual—The whole applied.

3. OF FREEWILL  
Doctrine of imputation and a covenant—Radical



the influence of Satan  
irresistible  
—Unnecessary  
consequence drawn by  
Calvinists —  
Consequences on the  
other side—The question  
of faith and  
works—Distinction of  
absolute and covenanted  
merit.

5. OF PERSEVERANCE  
Dissent from the  
Calvinistic  
doctrine—The contrary  
is conformable to the  
human  
character—Passages  
from the Old

Testament—from the  
New—Exhortations and  
dissuasive — Passages  
alleged by  
Calvinists—Dangerous  
tendency of the  
Doctrine.

## CONCLUSION

The subject should be  
excluded from  
theology—Transactions  
in the Synod of  
Dort—Dean Hall's  
sermon—Dr. Priestley's  
acknowledgment —Late  
introduction of  
Calvinism.

## APPENDIX

No. 1.

# OF PHILOSOPHICAL NECESSITY

Consciousness opposed to necessity—Dr. Clarke's distinction between the mind and a balance—Consequences of supposing the mind acted on as a lever—Objection of confusion—Necessity overthrows praise and blame—Lord Kaims—Bp. Berkeley—David Hume—Restrictions on speculation—Danger of extending necessity to God—Mr. Leibnitz—Dr Priestley—President



Instance of his consistency.

## PART 3.

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians, with the opinions of the Early Fathers,*

### INTRODUCTION

The kind of evidence to be deduced from the fathers—The early fathers, silent on the points denominated Calvinism—This continued until the time

of St. Austin—Calvin acknowledges the fact.

## I. OF PREDESTINATION

### Apostolick

Fathers—Accounts of them by Mr. Toplady, Dr. Haweis, and Mr. Milner—Succeeding fathers—The time when predestination in the philosophical sense was introduced—Fathers later than the above—Consequence—Change effected by St. Austin—Interposition of the papal see—The subject purely metaphysical.

## 2. OF REDEMPTION

The question not found in a controversial form, in the early Fathers—Passages from them—Inadmissibility of evasion.

## 3. OF FREEWILL

A Caution— Sundry fathers—The subject, as it respects original sin.

## 4. OF GRACE

The question staled as it respects the fathers—Passages from them—Of the subject, as it regards faith and works.

5. OF PERSEVERANCE  
St. Austin did not extend his system to this point—Sundry fathers—A concession of Gerard Vossius—The opinion of Calvin, not altogether consistent with present Calvinism—Result.

## CONCLUSION

Application of authorities to the general question of the five points—The importance of this branch of the subject to protestantism.

## APPENDIX





## PREFACE

On an appearance of such a work as the present, it seems a tribute of respect due to the publick, to state the motive of the Author. Accordingly, he avows it to be the sustaining of what he conceives to be correct views, in the controversy which is the subject of the volumes. His station in the Episcopal church, and the agency to which circumstances have called him in the conducting of its concerns, may be supposed to have added to other sources of obligation, in





closed, if there had not been, subsequently, the excitement of an extraordinary degree of interest in the discussed subjects, both in England and in the United States of America; and if they had not been treated of, with an especial relation to the Episcopal church: the doctrines of which are here thought to have been in many instances misrepresented. The stating of them in a correct point of view, will of course be a principal object in this work.

The Author, in unfolding



from the circumstance, that what is conceived to be erroneous, has been published to the world by any, whether society or individual; yet, he thinks he perceives too zealous a disposition in some professors of religion, to construe as an attack on their respective systems, what others publish for the explaining and the sustaining of their own. This is a bias to hostility; which, if it were carried to its consistent extent, would describe the published standard of any religious body, as an attack on all













existing as early as the fifth century of the Christian church; but that subsequently to the period of the reformation, there arose on one of the sides referred to very important superadditions; which could not have been contemplated in the institutions of the church of England, and to which they are directly in opposition.

There is still another class of people, to whom the Author may be thought answerable, on the question of the propriety of the present measure. They are those who censure















consistent with the continuity of argument. This is the reason of their being attached, as appendices to the several parts, or as a General Appendix to the whole.

## ERRATA.

Page 53, 10th line of note for "Αντφοιον" read "Αντφη&"

87, 10th from hot. for "any," read "Another."

135, 4th line from top, the word " author's" ought to come in before the first word of the preceding line, 156, 17th line from top, before "much" read

“something” 161,12th do  
before “last” read “are” 175,  
15th do. for “ his” read  
“this”

ib. 16th do. for “fuerunt”  
read “fuerant”

190, 6th do. for “rescience”  
read “prescience”

209, 2d. do. for  
“by” read “on”

248, 3d. from bottom after  
“much” read “alive”

249, 2d. do. for  
“unregenerate” read  
“regenerate”

252, 15th. do. for  
“attachment” read “  
abatement”

312, 2d. line of 2d.  
paragraph, for “ included”



## PART 1

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians with the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans.*

## INTRODUCTION.

*The Object of the Inquiry—Mr. Locke's Plan of Studying the Epistle—Unity of Design—Overlooked by Dr. Whitby and Dr. Doddridge—The Epistle is argumentative—*



when, according to the opinion here entertained, the Epistle contains nothing directly to the purpose of the matter at issue between the litigants. To prove this, is the end of the present undertaking. The first satisfactory knowledge of the Epistle which the author received, was from the perusal of the exposition of Mr. Locke. This eminent person was not ashamed to confess, that, after having been long conversant in the Epistles of St. Paul, he made the discovery, that he had not understood the doctrinal





*with “doctrinal:” correctly affirming, in this sense, that the Epistle to the Romans is “didactic or doctrinal.”]*

but argumentative. Under this remark, however, there are included the first eleven chapters only: so that all beyond them is foreign to the design. The twelfth and thirteenth chapters are a beautiful delineation of Christian morals. The fourteenth is admonition, not without a degree of censure; probably designed to apply to some of those, whose cause St. Paul had

been advocating; although not relatively to the same subject. The fifteenth chapter is partly personal; and partly contains miscellaneous remarks, on the subjects which had gone before. The only remaining chapter is devoted to Christian and friendly salutation; not without a glance, in the conclusion, at the subject which had filled the body of the Epistle; and which seems to have still pressed on the Apostle's mind. But as to the first eleven chapters, they are entirely argumentative: and if so,

























incidentally introduced, there be given interpretations, making them quite foreign to the purpose of the writer, there needs not be any better proof—still keeping in view that the writer is St. Paul—of the incorrectness of such interpretations.

That there is in the Epistle the one design here affirmed, and that it is carried on without reference to other matters, any further than as they contributed to it, must depend for proof on such internal evidence, as, it is hoped, will appear in the







determination of a known difficulty of the day; in regard to the terms on which Gentile converts were to be admitted to Christian communion. They who, from Judaism, had embraced the Gospel, contended stiffly, that it was incumbent on the others to conform to the institutions of the law of Moses; to which they challenged perpetuity. Since then the composition is in a controversial form, why should it not be thought confined to the only known controversy, which shows its head in the

course of the Apostle's argument?

Of the many commentators who do not support this unity of design, it is here conceived, that the circumstance has an unfavorable effect on their interpretations, however excellent they may have been in other respects. There shall be named two only; one of them Dr. Whitby, reputed an Arminian; the other of them Dr. Doddridge, a Calvinist, although not in the extreme. Dr. Whitby states two great doctrines, as within the

contemplation of the Apostle; one of them, that of justification by faith alone; and the other, the mystery of the calling of the Gentiles. Now, although the former is largely treated of, as may be said of some other subjects; yet, there seems an error in understanding any of them to be treated of in any other point of view, than as aiding to the second point in the statement of Dr. Whitby. And had that learned man considered this as the one point, kept in view always in the Apostle's argument, and





Judaizing Christians, whatever disturbance they had occasioned to their less scrupulous brethren of the Gentiles, would not have admitted the imputation, that they were arraigning the excellency of the Gospel; acknowledged alike by the one party and by the other. Dr. Whitby elevates a subordinate design, to a rank that makes it coordinate with the principal: while Dr. Doddridge not only depresses the principal design from its proper station, and puts another in its stead; but does not even



be the excellency of the common law of England. This would bring before our minds a range of very great extent. But if there were added to the proposal words to this effect— As relative to the equality which it establishes between the nobleman and the commoner, and between the rich man and the poor, in every question involving security of person and of property—there would be a limitation of the subject, which must be expected to have great effect on the disquisitions of the proposer. Now it is





generally, who disregard it until they reach the eleventh chapter, are obliged to admit it there; although applying it to the very expressions, to which they had denied it in the preceding chapters. The distinction here sustained, may be made the more clear by the following comparison. It has been affirmed, of the French writers and of the English, that the former are the most distinguished by sprightliness, and the latter by solidity of thought. Now, it might be expected of any person, who should engage





kingdom in the heavens, it is natural to expect of a writer, especially of one under the influence of inspiration, that, in unfolding what belongs to the former, he should have his heart warmed and his thoughts elevated, by the contemplating of the more transcendent glories of the latter. Accordingly, we find such an effect of the foretaste of heaven, in this Epistle of St. Paul. Still the subjects, although kindred, are not the same: and therefore the Apostle never loses sight of his proper subject; which is the

Messiah's spiritual reign on earth, over a people calling on and called by his name. It may not only be remarked under this head, as under the preceding, that the Calvinistick writers, generally, are sure to adopt, in the eleventh chapter, what they had rejected in the chapters preceding; but of Dr. Doddridge in particular, that although he had rejected the other allied principle of national designation, as supported by Mr. Locke; yet, so early as in his interpretation, in the ninth chapter, of the





although it may happen of any present subject of the former, that he shall not reach the latter.

The last particular of the Epistle to be stated, is the implication in it, of a distinction between the state of covenant with God, affirmed under the preceding head; and the exclusive possession of the divine favor, in reference to another life, while that covenant continued; a distinction which will of course apply, under the Christian economy also: that is, neither in the one nor in the other, is

salvation limited to a state of visible covenant. As the passages of the Epistle, on the ground of which the affirmation is here made, will not come under review in the comparison that is to follow, there may be a propriety in offering them in this place.

There are the first two verses of the third chapter, from which the position to be now maintained is an obvious inference. The Apostle had been asserting the admission of the Gentiles within the pale of the Gospel, on equal terms with the Jews. These are







proper subjects of salvation, were it applicable. But no: they had been the chosen people of God, for the accomplishing of a purpose, which runs through the whole series of his dispensations to mankind, from the creation to the consummation of all things. They and all others will be responsible for an improvement of whatever light has been afforded them.

But the passage in the Epistle speaking the most strongly to the point, is in the second chapter, from

the eighth verse to the sixteenth. The Apostle, having denounced the threatening of “indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil, of the Jew first, and also of the Gentile,” adds— “But glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile.” There is no plausible way of evading the application of this, except by supposing, that the Apostle speaks of the converted Gentiles. But this is inconsistent with the evident tenour of the





























contemplated controversy, to fix the attention on the leading matter put to issue between the contending parties; bringing in, however, under the third and fourth points, certain subjects which they involve; although not explicitly declared in the points, as usually stated. The subjects here in view, appear to be intimately connected with large portions of the Epistle.

Perhaps it may be expected of him to deliver, under each point, his own opinion of the sense of scripture, in relation to that





# 1. OF PREDESTINATION.

*The Question stated—Sense of Chapter 8 verse 29, to end of chapter 9—Of chapter 10 and 11—Connexion of the whole with chapter 12, verse 1.*

THERE is no need to say much, in statement of the hinge on which the controversy turns, in relation to this first point of it. The disputants consent in the acknowledging of a predestinating of some to life, while all others are



30th verses of the 8th chapter, in which we read as follows:

“For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first born among many brethren. Moreover, whom he did predestinate, them he also called; and whom he called, them he also justified; and whom he justified, them he also glorified.”

Nothing will be here said

concerning the meaning of the word “called,” because it will come more properly in another place. When we take up the words, “foreknow,” and “predestinate,” they seem to give a great advantage to the Arminians, in relation to the distinction on which their whole doctrine of predestination rests. And indeed, if the Apostle could be properly considered as speaking principally of individual character, and principally in relation to another life, the authority would seem decisive.

[Two grounds are taken, in order to avoid the effect of there being given the first place to foreknowledge, and the second to predestination, in an enumeration of the divine acts according to the intended order. It is remarked, first, that the expression is simply, “whom he did foreknow,” without any mention of their faith and their obedience; and secondly, that the Greek word, “[GREEK WORD]” often signifies foreknowing with affection; which is proved by other passages of





But, according to the principle of interpretation here supported, nothing was further from his thoughts. The spirit of the sentiment seems to be, that, in contrariety to the opinion of there being no admission to a state of covenant with God, except agreeably to the institutions of the law, he had, before the giving of the law, declared his purpose of extending the covenant to the Gentiles; as had been shown in a preceding part of the Epistle: that accordingly, there was a





word makes the passage analogous to many other places of scripture; one of which is, where it is said:

**“How shall not the ministration of the Spirit be rather glorious?”**

*[2 Cor. 3:8]* —The Apostle could not have intended the glory hereafter, because he spoke of the past; and it is difficult to devise any meaning, besides that here ascribed to the expression. The reference supposed gives evident pertinency to the inference, that the

Gentiles, as such, were owned to be a people admissible to the covenant: And the passage, placed in this point of view, is analogous to St. Peter's use of the same argument, in the 8th verse of the 15th chapter of the Acts; where he says—

**“God, who knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us.”**

And what he understood, by giving them the Holy Ghost, is evident in the



“He, therefore, that ministereth to you the Spirit, and worketh miracles among you, doeth he it by the works of the law, or by the hearing of faith?”

[*Chap. 3:5*] That there had been, at the early period when the Apostle wrote to the converts in the capital of the empire, the same grace bestowed on them, is not only in itself highly probable, but seems referred to in several places of the Epistle. The first, worthy of notice, is in the

5th verse of the 5th chapter; where it is said—

**“The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts, by the Holy Ghost which is given unto us.”**

—The original word being expressive, elsewhere, of the pouring out of the extraordinary gifts, it is a circumstance, which favors the opinion of a reference to the subject here. The Apostle, indeed, denotes a manifestation to the hearts of the believers; and the having of a view to this is



*But this is here thought to detract from the weight of a sentiment otherwise very forcible; and besides, to make this one of the many places, in which he is represented as reasoning from insufficient principles. Any consciousness, existing in the minds of believing Gentiles, could be no evidence to believing Jews, of a point denied by them.]*

In the 8th chapter, there are sundry expressions tending to the same point. There shall be mentioned

only one of them. It is:

“The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God.”

*[Verse 16]*

It is not the same with a witnessing “*to* our spirit;” as some delight to consider it, because of the support which it then seems to give to a favorite fancy; but “*with* our spirit.” There are therefore two witnesses; one inward, which can be no other than the consciousness of a holy



endowments; although an application of the same to ordinary edification is the principal subject of the lesson given. The word “gifts,” throughout the writings of St. Paul, is descriptive of what comes front the miraculous interposition of the Holy Ghost ; standing thus distinguished from “the fruits of the Spirit which are the gracious endowments of the mind, or its moral habits. And there is probably another reference to the same effusion, in the 13th verse of the 15th chapter, where

it is said –

“Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost.”

For although “hope” is one of “the fruits of the Spirit,” agreeably to the distinction already taken; yet it is not probable, that the Apostle would have made such an allusion to its source, if the Romans could have said at this period, what had been said by









with the dignity of the Apostleship, but with his personal character and accomplishments.

Besides; all that follows to the end of the chapter is in agreement with the interpretation given; while it shows no pertinency to any other sense. For the Apostle, strong in the reasonings which had run through several preceding chapters and bringing them to a point, applies them thus:

**“What shall we then say to these things? If God be for**



“He that spared not his own Son, but delivered him up for us all, how shall he not, with him, also freely give us all things?”

*[Verse 32]*

Here the Apostle, transported by his subject, combines it with the beneficent tendency of the Gospel generally. They against whom he wrote did not deny, that Gentiles might be admitted to Christian communion, although they contended, that it should be through



**"Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect?"**

*[Verse 33]*

Chosen as we have been, under the publick evidence of a divine designation, what mortal shall presume to accuse us, on the account of our not conforming to what they erroneously imagine essential to the profession of his name?

**"It is God that justifieth:"**

*[Verse 33]*

**"Who is he that**

**condemneth?"**  
34]

[Verse

It is the sovereign Judge, who has signified the acceptance of our persons, by tokens evident to sense: who then shall oppose his prerogative by the opposite judicial sentence of our condemnation?

**“It is Christ that died, yea, rather that is risen again, who is even at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.”**



Christian communion and the condition of uncircumcised professors of the faith, to another description of persons, meaning the common persecutors of them both: And then he enumerates the variety of trials, to which men were at that time exposed, by the profession of Christianity. There is no need to comment on the affecting passage, because, although it will come in properly under another department of the present work, it is not to the purpose in this place, any further than as a

foundation of a remark, for the pointing out of what adds as well to the ornament, as to the argument of the passage, that the Apostle seems to insinuate to the Jewish disturbers of the peace of their Gentile brethren, a lesson to be drawn from the courage and the constancy with which they were enabled, by divine grace, to sustain the worst difficulties of the Christian warfare. This was, in itself, no small evidence of their being within the authorized pale of the profession, especially as those











interpretations which have no foundation in the passage. It is not the design to notice the various senses, which have been ascribed to the different verses in the chapter. Far from this, there will not be reviewed or reconsidered, to any considerable extent, what the author has heretofore taken the trouble to peruse; of the much greater proportion of which, he judges it better to be ignorant than to be informed.

The interpretation of part of the 8th chapter, makes a clear connexion of it with

the 9th; and it is difficult to devise any other interpretation, under which the connecting circumstance shall be seen. For if predestination, in the usual sense of the word, had been treated of in the latter part of the 8th chapter; and were to be resumed and more largely treated of in the 9th; it was foreign to the subject of those passages, to mix it with that of the rejection of the Jews as a nation; since the predestinating act must still be understood to have included individuals from among them, as well

as from among the Gentiles. But let the view be confined to national character and designation; and then, all is pertinent—all is sound argument.

The Apostle begins with a declaration, exciting the expectation of some afflicting truth to be disclosed. For, professing his sincerity in this solemn form—

“I say the truth in Christ; I lie not, my conscience also bearing me witness in the

**Holy Ghost”**

*[Verse 1]*

— he adds—

**“That I have great heaviness and continual sorrow in my heart.”**

*[Verse 2]*

The cause of this great heaviness and continual sorrow was confessedly the rejection of the Jews, declared soon afterwards. Here was great cause, it must be confessed; although in the estimation of a mind susceptible of

sympathy, nothing in comparison of the more dreadful and extensive reprobation, which it has been thought the object of this very chapter to affirm. Still, all for whom the Apostle feels in this place, are his countrymen, the Jews. The passage, although partly given in the introduction, is here repeated at full length for the connexion:

**“For I could wish that myself were accursed from Christ for my brethren, my kinsmen according to the**

flesh: who are Israelites, to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the Fathers; and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came; who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen."

*[Verses 3, 4, 5]*

There have been many ways thought of, to soften the harshness of this wish. The tense of the Greek verb admits the translation — I could have wished:













## **Sara shall have a son;"** *[Verse 9]*

the same promised son is declared, by the Apostle, to have been preferred to Ishmael, another son of Abraham—preferred to him, says the Calvinistick system, as an heir of immortality. Now let it be remembered, that the Apostle is framing his argument, to the apprehension of persons acquainted with the Old Testament and believing in its divine authority; and further, that he bestows no



**“Oh that Ishmael might live before thee!”**

God answers, that, although Abraham should have another and more favored son, yet, in regard to Ishmael, it should be as had been desired. Oh faithful Abraham! little didst thou imagine, when thou receivedst this promise, from him who knew thou wouldst

**“command thy children after thee,”**

that, in the









“being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to election, might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth;” it was said—“the elder shall serve the younger;”  
[Verses 11, 12]

And

“Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated,”  
[Verse 13]

or esteemed him less.



prophet Malachi; where he introduces the Most High speaking thus—

**“I loved Jacob, and I hated Esau; and laid his mountains and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.”**

*[1, 2, 3.]*

And to show further, how foreign this is from the use made of it by some, it refers to the fortunes, not of the persons, but of their posterities. For when did Esau serve his brother Jacob?

Or what evidence is there, of the wasting of the heritage of the former, in his own day? Everything recorded of the brothers has a contrary appearance; especially their interview described in the 33d chapter of Genesis, and the account given in the 36th chapter, of the splendour of Esau's progeny, just before the mention of the incidents in the family of Jacob, which ended in his retreat to Egypt, where he lived and died dependent. The construction thus given to the 12th verse of the 9th chapter of the





Calvinistick, and in contrariety to the Arminian scheme. For he grounds the fortunes of the brothers, not on their faith and their works foreseen, but on sovereign will. The advocates of the latter system seem to have no way of getting over the difficulty, but by the help of the truth here sustained, that individual character and everlasting life are not the direct object of the argument. Indeed, if they be, the authority of this passage extends further than is consistent with the Calvinistick doctrine, and

thus proves too much. For, not being willing to admit, that the Divine Being will sentence an innocent person to perdition, the doctrine represents sin as no part of the decree, although a permitted mean for the accomplishing of the end of it. But in the case of Esau, the decree is unconnected with evil works, not only as foreknown, but as the medium, thought essential for the vindication of divine justice.

*[Philip a Limborch, who is in general a judicious*







“What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with God?”

answering his own question tho —

“God forbid!”

*[Verse 14]*

It is here evident, that he so far treats the question with respect, as to imply, that the mind of man may lawfully inquire, concerning a mode of proceeding ascribed to God, whether it be

consistent with the righteousness which must be an unalienable attribute of his nature. There are, indeed, many places in Scripture, in which the divine Being condescends to reason with his creatures, concerning the equity of his dealings and of his commands. The Calvinistick scheme itself, as already noticed, does not hesitate to judge, that God cannot justly damn his creatures, without previous sin. It must, then, be a mistake to suppose, that the Apostle treats it as an act of arrogancy to compare













these sentiments is to be drawn from the 15th verse of the chapter, where the Almighty is quoted, saying, in Exod. 33:19 —

**“I will have mercy on whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on whom I will have compassion.”**

As the English word “mercy” is so much used in connexion with the forgiveness of sin, it is probable, that even this circumstance may have sometimes contributed to



**“So then, it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy.”**

*[Verse 16]*

This still refers to the relative circumstances of the brothers, particularly, to the elder's running in quest of the venison; and his eagerly coveting of the blessing, though in vain.

Next, is the case of Pharaoh, concerning whom it is said, by the Sovereign of the whole earth—

**“Even for this same**

purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee; and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth.”

*[Verse 17]*

To make it of any use to the Calvinistick scheme, it should have been—

“For this purpose I have brought thee into being.”

But no; Pharaoh may be supposed to have been found with a mind regardless of the power of God, before he was raised

up, for the end stated. Neither is the expression, “raised thee up,” exactly expressive of the words in Genesis; which signify, agreeably to the translation in the margin, “made thee stand up.” *[Exod. 9:16]* Under this construction, which is supported by the translation of the Septuagint, the sentiment is to this effect—

**“I might have cut thee off with thy subjects, in my judgments already inflicted before thine eyes; but I have sustained thee and**

made thee stable in thy kingdom, for a heavier judgment still to come."

For although the Apostle uses a word, alike pertinent, indeed, to his own purpose, yet varying in sense from the Hebrew, he cannot reasonably be supposed to have designed this, in order to give countenance to an hypothesis, not warranted by the original text. Now, that by the destruction of Pharaoh and his host in the Red Sea, the name of God was glorified in the

Israelitish nation, is evident in sacred history. And that it was also glorified in the neighbouring nations, may easily be believed; although no record of it is to be found, in the, work of the Father of profane history, Herodotus; who had but little transmitted to him, of transactions so early as those of the period here referred to. But, that the name of God had been glorified in the earth, by the eternal damnation of this wicked prince, does not appear; and especially, it cannot be imagined that



narrative implies, this wicked prince, hitherto untouched by calamities which did not affect his person, and beholding his unhappy end inevitable and near, did not lift up his once **stubborn** heart, now subdued and softened, in accepted penitence, to the Lord of life and death? Be this as improbable as it may, it must be confessed possible; which excludes all interpretation of St Paul's reasonings, as if grounded on the acknowledged event of his damnation. And if so, there can be no consequence unfavorable

to our system, in what is added—

**“Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth:”** *[Verse 18]*

this hardening being in agreement with other places of scripture, in which there is ascribed to God that which has its origin in the wickedness of men, and which he permits, with a view of overruling it to a subserviency of his designs. And that no more is here meant, we find





prerogatives of his government, for the having made this people or the other people what they are; as if the clay should deny the right of the potter, “to make one lump to honour and another to dishonour.” This similitude is taken from the 6th verse of the 18th chapter of Jeremiah, by which we ought of course to be governed, in the interpretation of it. It is there distinctly applied to the speaking “concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, and to destroy;” and “concerning a nation and

concerning a kingdom, to build, and to plant it." Will it be said, that Jeremiah had within his contemplation anything beyond the present life? He surely had not: And if so, there cannot be any reason to imagine, that St. Paul strained the allusion to a subject, so different as his is supposed to have been, from that of the prophet.

There was evidently no ground of analogy between the two subjects. A truth which was pertinent to the putting down of one kingdom and the setting up of another, was not equally

evident, concerning the respective condition of individuals in another life. And yet it is stated by the Apostle, as a matter in itself evident and not demanding proof.

Now the Apostle advances to the application of his preceding reasoning in verses 22 and 23—"What if God," (or more strictly, but if God—meaning, that forbearance is no relinquishment of purpose) "willing to show his wrath, and to make his power known, endured with much long suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction:







For, after applying the metaphor of “vessels of mercy,” by declaring them to be—

“even us, whom he hath called, not of the Jews only, but also of the Gentiles;”

*[Verse 24]*

he goes on to recite the prediction of this call by Hosea, where it is said—

“I will call them my people, which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved.”

“And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people; there shall they be called the children of the living God.”

*[Verses 25, 26]*

So much, for “the vessels of mercy,” as a people. And then, showing that “the vessels of wrath” were designated such, as a people also, the Apostle goes on to quote Isaiah predicting the rejection of the Jews—Though the number of the children of Israel be as the sand of the

sea, a remnant (meaning this only) shall be saved;" and—"except the Lord of Sabaoth had left us a seed, we had been as Sodoma and been made like unto Gomorrha." [*Verses 27, 29*] Finally, the Apostle omitting nothing in this whole department of his Epistle, that might show the national complexion by which it was intended to be characterized, winds up his argument thus: He puts the question—"What shall we say then?" [*Verse 30*] He answers, implying it is this which should be said, that "the Gentiles"—he still











epistle is applied by Calvinism. There are also explicitly announced a “casting away” and a breaking off; [Verses 15, 17] yet connected with a grafting in again. [Verse 23] Now as these expressions, in the eleventh chapter, have a retrospective view to “the vessels of wrath” spoken of in the ninth; nothing but the supposition of the entire change of subject and of style can prevent a direct hostility of the expressions, against the Calvinistick scheme. There is a still greater difficulty in



supposition of individual interpretation, there is the assurance, that at last, "all Israel shall be saved;" *[Verse 25]* no exception being made of those who were before called "the vessels of wrath, fitted to destruction." The difficulty seems stretched to the utmost, when we find, as the finishing stroke of the whole argument, that "God hath concluded all in unbelief that he might have mercy upon all:" *[Verse 32]* that is, according to the opinion here rejected, if the maintainers of it were consistent, on all mankind;



interpretation here opposed, it might be supplied by the strains in which the Apostle, after the conclusion of his argument, gives vent to the feelings of his heart. His argument had begun early in the 1st chapter, and closes towards the ending of the 11th. Then looking back, as would seem, on the whole ground gone over, he breaks out in effusions, which could no otherwise have been prompted, than by a glow of admiration of the infinite excellence of the divine Being, which had been displayed; and closes, with

the ascribing of due praise and glory to his great name:

“O the depth of the riches, both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord? Or who hath been his counsellor? Or who hath first given to him, and it shall be recompensed unto him again? For of him, and through him, and to him, are all things: To whom be glory forever.

**Amen."**

*[Verse 33]*

Had the epistle consisted of such a series of subjects as Calvinism supposes, a writer disclosing them to the world under the influence of inspiration, might fitly bow in submission, under a sense of the fearful sovereignty, illustrating its glory in the damnation of millions of intelligent creatures, appointed to them before their being called into existence, and without any undeservings of their own,



nature, or of the ways of providence, or of redemption, not seen in connexion with those parts of their theory which cast a shade over its beneficence, can indulge emotions, which have their origin in wonder and delight. But it may be doubted, that there are any of them, in whom the like are produced by a survey of the peculiarities of their system: And it is rather to be supposed, that they deem it sufficient to acquiesce, and not set up their reason, in contrariety to what they suppose to have been revealed. Other













*short of Deism, or even Atheism, or rather universal scepticism !” Life prefixed to the Treatise on religious Affections.]*

It was intimated, in the beginning of this work, that the subject of it ended with the 11th chapter. There will be no impropriety, however, in casting our eyes forward to its connexion with the chapter succeeding, which begins thus:

**“I beseech you therefore,**

brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service."

Had the Apostle been laying down a scheme of general and eternal condemnation, from which a very few only had been rescued, by a predestinating decree, it being at the same time impossible to affirm, concerning the persons to whom the epistle is addressed, that they were



Apostle might fitly apply the persuasive motive of the mercies of God, as an incitement to the sublime morality which was to follow.

## 2. OF REDEMPTION.

*The Question stated—Nothing to the purpose of the Controversy —The Sense of the Latter part of Chapter 5th.*

THE difference between the Calvinists and the Arminians, on this point,

may be stated in few words. The former believe, that Christ died for those only who are predestinated, agreeably to what they affirm under the preceding point; and that salvation is not possible to others; although offered to them, in order to constitute a ground on which they may be at last condemned. The Arminians believe, that the satisfaction of Christ was for all mankind, and for every one of them in particular; although none reap the benefit, but those who believe and obey the Gospel.



the 5th chapter. In that passage, both Mr. Locke and Dr. Taylor, of Norwich, make the word “many,” the same with “all,” and the word “all,” in the place where it is used, to be intended universally. Not so Dr. Whitby, or Mr. Limborth, both of whom consider the sense of the place, as confining the terms to believers. The writer of this considers the passage as implying, that the effects of Christ’s death are coextensive with those of Adam’s sin. Nevertheless, the universality of the



### 3. OF FREE WILL

*The Meaning of the term, as understood by both parties, who had no difference concerning it—There arises the Question of Original Sin, on which they differ—The Points of difference—Sense of Chapter 3, Verse 3—Sense of Chapter 8, Verse 7, in connexion with Chapter 7, from Verse 7—Interpretation before Austin—And by him.*

*[It has been remarked*



propriety of the word, the controversy turns on the question of power in the will, called by the Latins “liberum arbitrium,” but by the Greeks “[GREEK WORD]” and “[GREEK WORD].” It has also been called in Latins “ipsietas” Whenever there may be used 'he words “free will,” in the present work, it must be understood in compliance with custom; and to mean the same with what has been commonly intended to be expressed by the aforesaid Latin and Greek words.





















one side or the other right; or be the right of either in whole or in part; there is nothing in the epistle to the Romans, relative to any branch of the subject on which the parties are divided. The writer of the epistle, it is here contended, was intent on another subject, which very much interested his mind and the minds of those for whom he wrote. He does, indeed, make a short digression, to the mortality incurred through Adam; but for what purpose? The answer is:—Because of its being a fit medium for the



view. This was the showing of the insufficiency of an instituted law, to the effect of justification: of a law, which far from restraining our bad propensities, made their sinful nature more conspicuous than before.

But, to go on to the passages which have been thought applicable: The first passage to be here mentioned, is chapter 3:9. But it is to be taken as explaining and to be explained by the greater part of the first and second chapters, and a passage following it in the third. The Apostle having, in the









them." *[verse 26]*

So stands the charge, as it affected the Gentiles: And the Apostle, immediately after urging it on them, turns to the Jews, and addressing the nation, through the medium of an individual character supposed, he says—

**"Thou art inexcusable, O man, whosoever thou art, that judgest: for wherein thou judgest another, thou condemnest thyself: for thou that judgest doest the same things."**

*[Verse 1]*

After amplifying and illustrating this sentiment, he goes on thus—

**“Behold, thou art called a Jew, and restest in the law, and makest thy boast of God, and knowest his will, and approvest the things that are more excellent, being instructed out of the law; and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them which are in darkness, an instructer of the foolish, a teacher of babes, which hast the form of knowledge**

and of the truth in the law. Thou, therefore, which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? Thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? Thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? Thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege? Thou that makest thy boast of the law, through breaking the law dishonourest thou God?"

*[Verse 17—23]*

Thus stands the charge



capacity, and each in relation to the question of admission to the covenant of grace. For we run into manifest extravagances, if we consider the words as applicable to every Jew and every Gentile. First, it must be seen, that what the Apostle stated to have been charged, had not been charged on infants, nor on those who die at too early an age, to have committed any of the enormous crimes enumerated. It will not relieve from the difficulty, to say, that there was a taint of nature. There was so; but it had not been

charged; none but actual sins, and those of a very high grade, being found in the catalogue. But further, it is beyond belief, that the Apostle should have designed to charge all adult Jews and all adult Gentiles, with having been guilty of the very bad conduct, truly affirmed to be prevailing among, and tolerated by, their several communities. In regard to the heathen, the grammatical construction fixes every article of the charge on all and every one of them, if considered otherwise than in their collective



**“Men and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before God, until this day.”**

But the black catalogue of crimes will receive its proper application, if we keep in view the end of the Apostle’s argument, and not otherwise. The question concerned admission to the gospel covenant. The converted Gentiles did not set up a claim to it, on any other ground than that of mere favor. And therefore, there







verses of the second chapter, where he says—

**“He is not a Jew who is one outwardly; neither is that circumcision which is outward in the flesh; but he is a Jew who is One inwardly; whose circumcision is that of the heart, in the spirit, and not in the letter; whose praise is not of men, but of God.”**

These words must have some meaning. They cannot, then, be designed of such a character, as neither did nor could exist;



been said concerning the same nation, by the Psalmist in his day —

**“There is none righteous, no not one, there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way; they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no not one. Their throat is an open sepulchre; with their tongues they have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips. Whose mouth is full of cursing and**

bitterness. Their feet are swift to shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways, and the way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God before their eyes."

*[Verse 10, 18]*

These words, indeed, taken without regard to the connexion and the design of them, are indiscriminate. But we know, that in a quotation, there is more regard had to the sense and the spirit of the passage quoted, than to the pertinency of every

expression. Now, the words are from the 14th psalm, in which they are descriptive of prevalent and triumphant wickedness, indeed, but not of such as was universal: For the Psalmist immediately adds, concerning the workers of wickedness described—

**“Who eat up my people as they eat bread, and call not upon the Lord.”**

He goes on to speak of

**“the generation of the righteous;”**

in whose behalf he puts up the devout wish:

**“Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion!”**

The Apostle's quoting of the gloomy description above recited, is as if he had said—

**“What the Psalmist has recorded of the prevalent wickedness of his day, I apply to ours.”**

And the end of his



which he had quoted from the Psalmist—

**“Now we know, that what things soever the law saith”**

(meaning here, by the law, the whole body of Jewish scripture)

**“it saith to them who are under the law; that every mouth maybe stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.”**

Guilty, more or less, they

doubtless all are in his holy presence, and as such, “subject to his judgments,” as the margin of the Bible more literally translates. But the Jew claimed exemption, in virtue of the covenant. No; says the Apostle, it has no virtue, as to that effect; and therefore the new dispensation contemplates all the world, that is, both Jews and Gentiles, as on a level in regard to pretence of merit. The next passage to be noticed, is the much litigated one, confessedly the most difficult in the whole



Apostle, [verse 12] “as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin.” What is the death here spoken of? A spiritual death, say some; consisting in an utter insensibility to good. Be there such a death or not, it is a pity, from zeal for the establishing of it, to spoil the Apostle’s reasoning in this place. The death within his view was a known dispensation, passing before the eyes of all; and not to be involved in metaphysical disquisition. “And so death passed upon all men, for that” (or in whom, meaning











come." This he does; but although there must, of course, be a resemblance between the antitype and the type; yet he contends, that what is true of the one is more eminently so of the other.

Here comes in the most difficult part of the passage: and the difficulty consists, in determining precisely the points of the dissimilitude affirmed. There shall be given three interpretations; each of them supported by a great name: But as no one of them is entirely satisfactory to the writer of these

remarks, he will take the liberty—which he trusts is not presumptuous, when the inquiry is concerning truth—to offer an interpretation of his own.

The first to be named, is that of Dr. Whitby. He thinks, that they who had sinned in their own persons may be said to have died on that account; for instance, those Antediluvians, who were swept away by the flood. On this ground, it is supposed that a deduction being made of all who had sinned in person, the remainder are not so many as those made alive by

Christ: in which circumstance consisted the greater abounding of the gift, beyond the punishment. But this does not seem to answer the purpose, since they who sinned and died would have died, if they had never sinned, agreeably to what St. Paul says in another place—

**“In Adam, all die.”**  
*[1 Cor. 15:22]*

Accordingly, this sense of Dr. Whitby is objected to by Mr. Locke, who offers another, to the following



be spoken with due deference to so eminent a person—in the unsuitableness of the comparison drawn between the appetite of Adam, and the benevolence of Christ. In order to square the construction with the argument, it seems needful, that the things compared should not be in entire opposition to one another; but as to the matter in hand, alike: although one of them is to be supereminent over the other.

The third opinion is that of Dr. Taylor, which lays



found it difficult to have shown, wherein the benefit obtained by the death of Christ went beyond the regaining of what was lost through Adam. For although many and precious are the fruits of the former, in the gifts and the aids of the holy Spirit; yet they are all no more, than was necessary for the object to be accomplished. And besides, the supposed surplusage was at any rate—although great stress is supposed to be laid on it—foreign to the Apostle's argument; which is best satisfied by a strict analogy.

With diffidence, another interpretation is here proposed. The idea which will govern in it is, that although the passage is confessedly a digression, yet the Apostle does not digress to such a length, as to lose sight of the point which he had been laboring, and which it was his purpose to resume. There are two criticisms to be here made on the original. Mr. Locke translates “the many:” And conformably to such a translation it will be found, that, although the article is seldom joined in the New







his dispensation of mercy, that “the free gift is of many offences” (if they had been committed) “unto justification.” He goes on “For if by one offence” (as the margin properly has it) “death reigned by one; much rather” may it be, considering God’s overflowing mercy in the gospel, that “they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.”

*[Verse 17]* In both of the last preceding verses, there is here contemplated a reference to the Jewish

prejudices opposed. And it seems an argument in point, that if, as was admitted, all descriptions of men had lost their immortality by another's fault, it might well be believed, concerning a dispensation so beneficent as that of the Gospel, that all descriptions of men might receive under it the fruits of the merits of another—freely: for this is the circumstance, on which the stress is laid, or without the prerequisite of legal initiation and the subsequent burthen of legal works.



his first choice of words.

To go on then with the passage: “Therefore,” adds the Apostle, “as by one offence, judgment came upon all men”—Jew and Gentile—to condemnation; even so, by one righteousness;” that is, one act of it, “the free gift came upon all men,” of the same variety of character, “unto justification of life.” Then, the Apostle seems desirous of expressing the same truth in varied language, for the greater clearness. “For,” says he, “as by one man’s [v19] disobedience, the many ”(Jews and





should not be accurate in every particular, it may be sufficiently so, for the purpose of the writer. On the ground of the interpretation,

Arminians can draw nothing from it, in favor of their system. For, although there may seem something to this effect, in what is said of “all being made righteous;” and of the free gift to “the many,” interpreted by respectable authority to be the same with “all;” yet, if these expressions are so positively applied, as is here affirmed, to different









*would have been transmitted to him, had there been no forfeiture through the father.]*

Nothing of the imputation of sin, except of men's sins to themselves; and nothing of the corruption of human nature, whatever there may be of this in the passage that is to succeed. There is, indeed, in the passage which has been commented on, a death spoken of. And that this word, like other words, is sometimes transferred from its strict signification, and used figuratively, to denote a



under a spiritual death, including an entire depravation of nature and subjection to everlasting punishment; so, at least an opportunity of attaining to salvation has been bestowed on all; if not rather, that it shall certainly be enjoyed by all: neither of which would be admitted by him, who subjects himself to such a consequence.

We proceed to another passage, weighty in meaning. It ought to be so, indeed, in the estimation of all; but it is set up by one of the parties in view, as the









verse of the preceding chapter; from which there is a continuation of kindred sentiment, to the verse before us.

The Apostle, through the whole, opposes the purity of the law to inbred sin; by reason of which, the law, though “ordained to life,” *[v10]* was “found to be unto death,” by the condemning effect of the penalty annexed to it. He here uses some very strong expressions, as his manner sometimes is, and not in their most obvious senses. Thus he speaks of sin working in him all manner

of concupiscence; [v8] not meaning this, surely, as to the direct and designed effect of the law; but to show, that vicious propensities, the criminality of which he would not otherwise have known, or at least not have known in its extent, were displayed to him in all their enormity, by it. And thus it happened; that while compelled to acknowledge—

“The law is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good,” [v12] he became subjected by it to the sentence of death in his



opposition of opinion, among commentators and other writers; some ascribing the struggle which the first part of the passage describes, to the stranger to gospel grace; and others to the man subjected to its influence. On the opposite sides of the question, there shall be here mentioned two men, who may be supposed nearly equal in the greatness of their talents—Mr. Locke and Dr. Samuel Clarke. Had the writer of this been left to his own understanding only, he should have

supposed it impossible to have entertained any other opinion, than that of the passage being designed of the sinner; partly, because the violence of the struggle seems little consistent with that subjection of passion, which must, in a considerable degree at least, adorn the character of the Saint; and further, because, in the conclusion, there is celebrated a triumph, as the effect of grace, in the struggle which had been described. Dr. Clarke is of the opinion, which has been here expressed. He supposes,

[serm. 9, vol. 8] that the Apostle personates a man, who is at first a stranger, both to the law and to the gospel; who, afterwards, is subjected to the law, which lays him under its condemning sentence, and who finally hears the consoling voice and is sensible of the powerful energy of the gospel. The opinion of Dr. Clarke is consented in, by many respectable commentators; of whom it may be sufficient to mention Dr. Hammond, Dr. Whitby, and Dr. Taylor. In the construction of this

passage, Mr. Locke agrees with the Calvinistick writers generally, not excepting Calvin himself; it being important to their system. Accordingly, they give as a reason of their interpretation, that, in the unregenerate man, there can be no such good desire, as St. Paul describes.

We are then to suppose the Apostle speaking to us, not in his own person, but in three supposed characters. The first is that of a man, without either the law or the gospel. The Apostle says, meaning it of such a man—"I was alive



After several remarks, opening this sentiment more distinctly, the passage goes on to describe the conflict between inordinate desire and the commandment set in opposition to it.—

**“That which I do, I allow not; for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law, that it is good. Now then, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know that in me, that is in**

my flesh, dwelleth no good thing. For to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good, I find not. For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now, if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and

bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members."

[v15-23]

The Apostle had thus discoursed of man, first in his natural state; and then, as a subject of the Mosaick dispensation. After this, he discourses of a conflict, as belonging to both these states, but applied especially to the latter, which was more immediately connected with his design. Here we perceive two principles; on one hand, a principle

allowing, consenting to, and delighting in what is good; and on the other, a principle bringing into captivity to the evil, although a known enemy and hated. Now, this is no other, than that struggle between virtue and vice, which has been observed and lamented in mankind, under all the varieties of their condition; and which, although more emphatically perhaps described by St. Paul than by any other, is in substance the same with the old and familiar adage—

“I see and approve of the better, but pursue the worse.”

What establishes the interpretation here given of the passage, as applying to the natural and not to the Christian man, is, that the Apostle, after having described the conflicting principles in the breast of the personated character, makes him exclaim, under a sense of the misery of his estate—

“O wretched man that I

am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death?"

[v24]

then making him answer his own question, under the disclosure of gospel grace, supposed just then to open on him—"I thank God, through Jesus Christ our Lord." [v25] The Apostle, returning to his former point, sums up what he had said concerning it, thus—"So then with the mind, I myself, this man, who has been described, "serve the law of God; but



captivity, which had been groaned under before. It is one of the instances of the candour of Dr. Doddridge, that he releases this important passage from the claims of Calvinism: expressing himself concerning it, in a note, as follows—“I should not have known sin,’ &c. “The Apostle here, by a very dexterous turn, changes the person, and speaks as of himself. This he elsewhere does, [*Rom. 3:6, 1 Cor. 10:30, 4:6*] when he is only personating another character. And the character assumed here, is













scripture; such as—"they that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with its affections and lusts;" with many things to the same effect.

There is a striking fact of early times, showing how much the passage in question has been seen to stand in the way of the doctrine now called Calvinistick. Before the time of St. Austin, it had been generally interpreted—among others by Tertullian, Origen, and Chrysostom—of man first in his natural state, then under the law, and lastly

under the gospel. Austin himself had explained it in the same way.

*[In his Confessions, Lib. 7. last paragraph]*

But having afterwards adopted some of the sentiments since called Calvinistick, he revoked the interpretation; and applied the passage to the struggle still subsisting in the regenerate man, between grace and nature. But even under this change, he seems to have shrunk back from the full length of the modern Calvinistick













## 4. OF GRACE.

*The Question stated—  
Nothing relative— Some  
Passages, which may be  
thought to apply—  
Relation of the Subject to  
the Question concerning  
good Works— Fourth  
Chapter, with resulting  
Considerations.*

THE Calvinists and the Arminians agree in affirming, that the disorders of our nature can be healed only by the grace of God, which begins, and brings to perfection,

whatever is holy and acceptable to God, in man. But the Calvinists say, that saving grace is given only to the elect; in whom it is irresistible and efficacious. The Arminians hold, that grace is bestowed on all; that it is sufficient for their salvation; but that it acts suasively, and may be resisted.

The principal question, then, is that of resistible or irresistible influence of the Holy Ghost, in conversion. Now, the epistle does not contain any thing which has ever been alleged to be a direct affirmation,









believe in him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach, except they be sent?"

[Professor Michaelis remarks, in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, Vol 4. Ch. 14 Sec. 1, that "GREEK" is an expression borrowed from the Septuagint, to denote a congregation called together for divine worship.]

There is something further, however, to be said















considers the offering of Isaac as a work; although, on the plan of reasoning of St. Paul, it was an act of faith, in another sense of the expression. And here, by the way, there may be propriety in noticing the extraordinary use made of the part of the passage now before us, in the doctrine of what is called the imputed righteousness of Christ. The favorers of this doctrine bring in proof of it, what first the history of the Old Testament, and afterwards an Apostle mention, as imputed to a man's self: imputed,

certainly, by the free grace of God, although it be not expressly said so. If it be replied, that all grace of God is through Christ, this will not be denied; although it will be contended, that the manner in which the grace is conferred is foreign to the present subject. But to return to the Apostle's argument. The way in which it applies to the purpose, is, as he expresses himself on the same subject in another epistle, that “the covenant, that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law, which was





















## 5. OF PERSEVERANCE.

*Opposition of the parties—Sense of Chapter 8, Verse 38, 39 - And of Chapter 11, Verse 29.*

THE impossibility of falling finally from grace, is what the Calvinists affirm and the Arminians deny. The object here is to prove, that the epistle has nothing to the purpose of either of the parties.

In favor of the doctrine, there are not recollected more than two passages adduced. The first of them,

are the last two verses of the 8th chapter—

**“For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.”**

Be it confessed, that none of them can separate, in the important matter mentioned: But may not a



on, mentioning every one of those whose malice we were defying, should deprive our client of his privilege. But it would not follow, nor would we design to affirm, that he might not forfeit it by treason, or lose the benefit of it by expatriation.

The other passage is in the 29th verse of the 11th chapter; where we read—“The gifts and calling of God are without repentance.” Now, even if these words had been spoken of men in their individual capacities, it would not follow, that there might not be a

forfeiture of their calling, by apostasy on their part; although they could not lose it by repentance on the part of God. But in truth, the words are intended of the Jews, in their collective capacity; and express, that although in their character of a nation, they were now cast off; yet their original calling stood firm, ensuring their being brought in again.

On the part of the Arminians, there has been adduced the passage of which the last quoted words are part; to show, that persons once in a state

of acceptance with God, may be finally rejected by him: because, say they, certain, who were in existence at the time of the casting off, died in their unbelief, before the bringing in again; which will not happen, until “the fulness of the Gentiles shall have come in.” Still, the matter affirmed was of the nation; leaving: the case of the individual as it was before.

There ought to be noted, in this place, the ground on which the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints is here considered as





former with a strength effected by his own energy, lest they should perish; and that to the latter he does not furnish the same support, to the end that they may be examples of inconstancy.” *[Book 2. chapter 5 sec. 3]*

He also affirms the regeneration of infants, in the ordinance of baptism. For speaking of their case, he says — “The promise, in which we have explained the virtue of the sign to consist, is the same in both” (circumcision and baptism) “consisting in the fatherly favor of God,









# CONCLUSION.

*The points agreed on—Reasons of the form of this discussion—Remarks on St. Paul's Epistles—And on the Epistle to the Romans in particular.*

THERE has often occurred to the author of this work, during the progress of it, the danger of a reader's suspecting him of an insidious design—that of insinuating concerning certain important subjects of religion, their being foreign to the sense of







































Scripture should be represented as being principally employed on a temporary subject of litigation; not exciting any uneasiness in the Christian world, any longer than during the age in which the book was endited. That this should be no objection to the argument of the present work, might be proved from many parts of scripture; which have evident relation to early errors, of no longer continuance than that of the perpetual obligation of the Mosaick law. In the epistle which has been





would be again the result of the same depraved passions of human nature. The part of the argument which unveils the aggravation of the criminality of the Jews, in the contrariety of their practice to their law, will forever admonish professing Christians, of the greater inconsistency of corrupt morals, in contrariety to the holy requisitions of the Gospel. If the Jews could not consider God as their debtor, in virtue of any obedience which they could pay to the Mosaick law;







out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

There is in this a powerful incentive of faith and hope; especially when we observe before our eyes, existing monuments of the accomplishment of the threatening; and when we perceive the train laid, of events pointing to the better accomplishment of the promise; and destined to demonstrate, in regard to the ancient people, that the calling of them is "without repentance." And it is further obvious, concerning the splendour















# APPENDIX: ON THE CASE OF THE HEATHEN

*Calvin and others on the Subject — Calvinistick Churches — The Point of Difference between Christians and the Heathen — Authorities from the Old Testament — The Circumstances of Idolatry — Authorities from the New Testament.*

IT was hinted in the introduction to this work, that there attached to the general question of it the subordinate question, how





presumed than proved in the body of the performance, so there is a trust, that it cannot be deemed superfluous, in reference to the Calvinistick theory; which pronounces a severer sentence on the heathen world, than any here conceived to be found in the word of God, or to be inferred from it. Calvin affirms [*Book 2. ch. 2. sect. 22*] — “The end of the law of nature is, that man may be rendered inexcusable;” and again: “To deprive men of the pretext of ignorance, while they are convicted,

even by their own testimony.” And just before, commenting on Romans, 2:14. he had said—“Because it might have seemed absurd, that the Gentiles should perish without any previous knowledge, he” (the Apostle) subjoins, “immediately that their conscience supplies the place of a law to them; and is therefore sufficient for their condemnation.”

Conformably to this, when speaking of predestination in the 5th section of the 21st chapter of his 3d book, he says— “This, God has









any other. They have more information of the process of the moral government of God, from the creation to the consummation of all things. They have more ample and more excellent instructions for the government of life. They have more persuasive motives to a suitable practice. In the event of falling into sin, they have stronger incitements to repentance; especially in the communication made to them of the great sacrifice for sin, and of acceptance through its merits. They have













although they could not save the city, were themselves saved by a permitted flight; what are we to conclude, but that the fugitives are affirmed by scripture history to be righteous? And as to Lot himself, he is expressly so called by St. Peter. 2d. Ep. 2:8.

Next, when we read of Abimelech King of Gerar, on the occasion of a judgment brought on his subjects, drawing nigh to God with the expostulation—“Lord wilt thou slay also a righteous nation;” and when we find

the same Abimelech the subject of a divine admonition and promise, it is not natural to conceive of himself and of his people, as cast off from the love of God.

Another instance is Melchisedeck, King of Salem; a righteous king, as is denoted by his name. This man was evidently without the covenant; and yet, he is called a priest of the most high God, and made a type of the Messiah, who is “a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedeck.”

We may go on, beyond



















This may serve for argument, as well as for example: For although it is a frequent practice to evade the full force of the words, by referring them to God's not sending till then of a revelation against prevalent idolatry, yet, were it not for the effect on the point before us, it could hardly be overlooked, that the natural construction makes them declaratory of his not rigorously punishing, where there was want of better information to prevent.

When we go on to the New Testament, the first











*stating of the above would suffice for the refutation of it.]*

When it is said in Luke 12:47, 48—

“That servant which knew his lord’s will, and prepared not himself, neither did according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes, but he that knew not, and did commit things worthy of stripes, shall be beaten with few stripes;”

it is implied, that men will











of the providential care of God in the present life: Still, if that care be extended to men, only to aggravate a condemnation, necessarily resulting from the circumstances in which the same providence had placed them; such declarations, to say. the least, are not to the purpose for which they seem to have been made, of magnifying the goodness of the divine Being.

There is another remarkable passage in St. Matthew 8:11. compared with St. Luke 13:29. The words are nearly the same









the words here remarked on; which of course designate persons opposed to the preceding, in regard to opportunity of receiving instruction and making a profession.

Dr. Taylor gives the following reason—and it seems of great weight—against the interpretation exploded. He says, that according to it, the assertion of our Saviour is not in point. It makes an opposition between the present children of the kingdom, that is, the Jews; and the future children, that is,

Christians: Whereas, the opposition ought to be between the former, and such persons as the centurion, that is, heathens. The manner in which the three passages last quoted are treated by Dr. Doddridge, is worthy of notice. In his interpretation of that of St. Matthew 8:11, and that of St. Luke 13:29, he has not a word expressive of the sentiment of other writers on his system, limiting the description of the righteous to a proportion of the professors of all nations; but gives an interpretation

which implies, but does not positively express the opinion, here sustained. It is more evidently implied, although still not expressed, in his interpretation and improvement of Matthew 18:11. But when he comes to the passage in the 10th chapter of the Acts, the opinion is evident in the interpretation, and still more so in a note; in which he comments as follows on the words—

**"He that feareth him and worketh righteousness is**

accepted with him." —

"This, for anything I can see, might be supposed the case of many, who were far from being in any degree Jewish proselytes, and had never heard of the Jews and their religion, as it was certainly the case of many, before the peculiarities of Judaism existed, and even before the institution of the Abrahamick covenant. I think this text proves, that God would sooner send an angel to direct pious and upright persons to the

knowledge of the Gospel, than suffer them to perish by ignorance of it."

The above is exactly to the present purpose. But in the remainder of the note, principally intended to distinguish the case of Cornelius, from that of persons who reject Christian light bestowed, Dr. Doddridge seems to have entertained the further design of avoiding a shock to prejudice, by what had gone before. For, speaking of the sense of the passage as opened by him,





## PART 2

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians, with Holy Scripture generally.*

### INTRODUCTION.

*Dissent from on Calvinism—Not on Arminian Principles—Origin of Calvinism—Its Progress—Its Alliance with Philosophical Necessity—Difference between this and Original*

*Calvinism—Net in the  
Decrees of the Synod of  
Dort—Since embraced by  
various  
Calvinists—Proposal to  
exclude it from Theology—  
Result, is the stating of  
Scripture Doctrine.*

THE author, wishing to give an early insight of his design, begins with the intimation, that it will be, principally, to prove what he believes to be the errors of the Calvinistick system; while yet, the opinions which he is about to oppose to them will not be built on the Arminian foundation.





appointed to them. On the contrary the Arminian, offended by what he thinks an impeachment of the divine benevolence and justice, supposes that he avoids the difficulty, by founding predestination on prescience: So that, according to him, the different allotments are predicated on the foreseen uses of a liberty to be bestowed on all. Whether the position of a predestination founded on prescience be true or otherwise, considered as matter of human speculation, the author





























has reclined on the prop  
thus presented, in failure of  
support formerly supposed  
to be abounding sufficiently in  
the scriptures.

What is undertaken under  
this branch of the subject,  
will have been sufficiently  
performed, if it should be  
shown concerning the  
doctrine of philosophical  
necessity, that it originated  
with, and in its progress  
has been improved  
principally, by men who  
were either indifferent or  
unfriendly to  
revelation—that, in some  
important particulars, it is

























misconception in supposing it intended to be here affirmed, that the doctrine has been confined to unbelievers in the scriptures. It is only contended, that its principal projectors and improvers have been of that description: and this, as an introduction to the second particular — the points in which it differs from Calvinism as held formerly; of which the test shall be the sentiments of Calvin himself, in his celebrated work called “The Institutions of the Christian Religion.”





























slave to sin, and has nothing of himself, unless it is given him from heaven."

In regard to the third particular, it is said in the twelfth canon, under the third and fourth heads, after a declaration of the change of the sinner wrought by grace — "The will thus renewed, is not only actuated and influenced by God, but, in consequence of this influence, becomes itself active." Thus different from the present Necessarian Calvinism, was the system established by the very Synod, which was

summoned for the purpose of extirpating opposing opinions; and for the guarding against any which might otherwise arise in future. However inimical both Calvin and the Synod of Dort to the name of freewill, it seems to have been adopted by their followers generally, within half a century after the Synod. For Professor Turretine, of Geneva, a standard writer of the Calvinistick opinion, not only uses the word and defends it in his system of divinity, [*Locus 9. chap. 41*] but considers the

affirmation of its being rejected by those of his persuasion, as a calumny. What he says on the subject is as follows, and must be perceived to be in direct contrariety to what had been said on it by Calvin—“Although this name may seem too proud, and although some may, on that account, have wished it removed from the church; yet, as it has been so long in use with her, we judge that it may be usefully retained; provided the right sense of it be taught and abuse avoided. Wherefore, it cannot without calumny be









have written so much and so zealously in favor of Calvinism, as Mr. Toplady and Dr. Haweis; both of whom have considered the Calvinistick scheme as supported by the Necessarian. Mr. Toplady, in various places, treats it as the height of impiety and of folly to deny them: And as to Dr. Haweis, it is obvious how decided a Necessarian he must have been in the circumstance, that, however great St. Austin in the estimation of Calvin, and however great in that of all those reformers and of others









particularly Augustine, Theophilus Gale, and a class of German theologians of the school of Leibnitz." As to Austin, it would be difficult to show, in what respects he differs materially from Calvin, who evidently considered himself as treading in his steps. It is remarkable, that Calvin is not mentioned by Dr. Smith, among the few who are noticed as giving their sanction to his own view of Calvinism: And as to looking back to Austin for the ground work of the Necessarian scheme, there is here doubted the

propriety of it. There seems no other coincidence in the two opinions, than what may be found in two roads, which, beginning in different quarters, come in contact at certain points. With the writings of Theophilus Gale, the writer of this is unacquainted. He was certainly a Calvinistick divine, of eminent reputation: And if his works contain the principles of philosophical necessity, Dr. Priestley has been mistaken in mentioning President Edwards, as the first Calvinist who had owned

them. Dr. Smith's claim to the countenance of the Leibnitzian school is not to be denied; and his introducing of its authority is to the purpose for which his own is introduced, in the present work. He does not go into argument on the subject of the controversy; but only professes to give a correct statement of the Calvinistick opinions; in order to guard against what he thinks a mistaken representation of them by Mr. Belsham. It seems inconsistent, that the former, writing with this





necessity. Dr. Priestley, in his work on the latter subject, is careful to point out the differences between the two. And now, his friend Mr. Belsham—a Necessarian also—refuses to know Calvinism, except as contained in publick confessions. Not so, indeed, Lord Kaims; as set forth already. But the reason of the difference is discernable. His Essay on Liberty and Necessity had subjected him to the charge of irreligion. Accordingly, he availed himself of the aid of President Edwards's book on the will, which











been applied. It is sufficient, that the armour, thus wielded in defence of what is thought a Christian fortress, was wrought on a foreign anvil: And this is only brought in aid of the considerations intended to prove, that the works defended are of human and not of divine structure.

This leads to another object of the ensuing investigation; a mere inference from what has been premised: The effect of which will be, if the view to be here taken of the subject should be correct, that there ought to be an





























may be a predetermination of their being fruitless. And in this case, ministers may preach, and the people may hear, under the impression, that there are set before men, in every instance, life and death; an eternal blessing, and an eternal curse; making salvation, indeed, if they should attain to it, the free gift of God; but their perdition, if this should be the sad reverse, the consequence of their sinful state, inexcusably and without an over-ruling destiny persevered in.

These remarks, however,















# 1. OF PREDESTINATION.

*Of the Term “Decree”—Predestination only incidentally found in other Books—Predestination and Election mean the same in all—Phrases, thought similar in Sense—The Situation of St. Paul—Sundry Passages of Scripture—A constructive Sense - Useless Questions—Rules—The Subject, being foreign to Scripture, must be judged of on Principles of Reason—A Point, on which the Parties are agreed—A*

*Deduction from what should be considered as the Point of Difference—The Result, in Relation to the Divine Attributes.*

ON the very threshold of this gloomy building, the attention of the author is drawn to what he considers as no slight evidence of its having been raised, not by scripture, but by metaphysicks. It is the necessity which has occurred of calling in the word, “decree,” to answer some purpose, to which the word, “predestination” does not extend. For there



















reasonably be supposed to have the same meaning, in the other epistles of the same Apostle. Thus, when he tells the Ephesians, speaking of the Father's "having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ, to himself;" [1:5] and when he says to the Thessalonians:

[1:1-4] “Knowing, brethren beloved, your election of God;” and to the same people in his other epistle to them—“ God hath from the beginning chosen you to salvation;” [2:13] he can mean no more, than to support a truth which he

has often occasion to refer to, in opposition to the favorers of legality, that the Gentiles were called, in an emancipation from the institutions of the law. And nothing could so effectually sustain this sentiment, as the resting of it on the divine purpose, entertained before the giving of the law, and even before the foundation of the world.

The passage from the 2d epistle to the Thessalonians, is thought to give weight to the Calvinistick interpretation, by the words, “from the beginning.” It seems



Thessalonians were not among the earliest believers. Still, if we abide by the rule laid down, the divine dispensations relative to the Gospel ought to bound the interpretation.

It seems indeed impossible to prove from scripture, that the expression, “from the beginning,” ever denotes eternity in the strict and proper sense. In the 1st chapter of Genesis, the words, “in the beginning,” look no further back than to the creation; and that confined probably to the

system of which our globe is part. The first words in the gospel of St. John—"In the beginning was the word"—are often quoted to prove the eternity of the divine nature of the Messiah. There seems however something more to the purpose, in what follows in the same verse and in similar places of scripture; ascribing to the Son divine attributes, derived to him from the Father. The mere expression, "in the beginning," is here conceived to be too indeterminate to found the









were intended of the body, and that in reference to the subject of church communion. But if it were applied to them individually, and with a view to their destination in another world; it is not to be supposed, that there should be charged, on some of these elect, faults which are incompatible with the Christian state. For this is done by the Apostle, relatively to some members of the Thessalonian church; when he describes them thus: “We hear that there are some which walk among you disorderly,

working not at all, but are busybodies.” *[2Thess. 3:11]* Are these they whom he had assured in the preceding chapter *[2:13]* —that they had, “from the beginning, been chosen unto salvation?” Yet this is what the Calvinistick sense requires. But no, the Thessalonians, collectively considered, were chosen to be a church of God, living in visible profession of his name; and this no doubt with a view to the salvation, of which such a profession was the mean: while, as to every individual and his attaining to the same





world began,” it will not be rash to say, that it does not necessarily mean more, than before the different dispensations of the divine economy in the present world; and that this must be the meaning, especially in the place last referred to; which speaks of a promise made before the ages in contemplation. The words are—“In hope of eternal life, which God, who cannot lie, promised, before the world began.” The passage cannot be supposed to look further back, than to the promise made in paradise of the seed of the woman to

bruise the serpent's head. The like may be said of another expression, that of Ephesians, 3:11 translated: "According to the eternal purpose," but of which the literal meaning is—"According to the afore-disposing of the ages." Of these, the last was the evangelical; which shows, that the others could reach no further back, than those preparatory to it. In systematick discussions of the doctrine of predestination, it is common to find this text brought forward as the prominent authority, for

the affirming of the decrees of God, that they are eternal. Professor Witsius acknowledges that the expressions: “From the foundation of the world,” and “before the foundation of the world,” do not necessarily signify eternity. And he further acknowledges [*Book 3 chap. 4 sec. 15*] the same concerning the expression: “Before the world began.” And yet the same author quotes Ephesians 3:11, as directly declaring the eternity of God’s decree; whereas it would seem the furthest from it of all the







made on the word translated “eternal.” As applied to the present subject, it cannot mean a strict and proper eternity: It cannot in the passage quoted from the epistle to Titus; because the ages there spoken of, are connected with a promise confessedly made in time: And it cannot, even in that quoted from the epistle to Timothy; because all time must have had a beginning, as well as an end. The Greek words in question may be not improperly translated— “The times of



But for the construction thus given, the cause is indebted to the severing of the 4th verse from the 3rd, which makes a part of the same sentence. It is— “Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings, in heavenly places in Christ.” The sense of the place is, there being conferred on the Ephesians spiritual blessings, to the end that they should be holy. The predestinating of them to be a church gathered from among the heathens, is a circumstance

noticed of the case. So far as concerns the order of the acts of the divine mind, there is much more pertinent in a passage in the 1st epistle of St. Peter, 1:2. “Elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father.” Here, the election is evidently predicated to be founded on the foreknowledge, &c.

But let it be remembered, that these strictures on eternity, as connected with the decrees of God, are not necessary to the purpose, here entertained; which supposes, that, whether there be intended a strict



All his epistles to churches, are principally to those of the Gentile sort, except the epistle to the Hebrews, which, conformably with the view here taken of the subject, has nothing concerning predestination, or election, or purpose. Further, he found himself continually thwarted in his ministry, by a mixture of Judaism and Christianity; which had its foundation in the error, that there was but one chosen people; in the mass of whom, of course, all the receivers of the new doctrine should be merged. That St. Paul is











incidentally; or else by way of inference. For it will not be contended, that when different churches are addressed as the elect or chosen of God, their election is the prominent sentiment in the writer's mind. His principal purpose, in each place, is to deliver a different matter of instruction; and the other is at most a circumstance attached to it. But it may be said—the election spoken of is presumed; and built on as an acknowledged doctrine of the Gospel. There may be reason in this, if the remark made

















follows that there were none but he, if we suppose any spoken of besides “the chosen” or “the given;” of which, accordingly, Judas was one. Dr. Doddridge remarks, that the Greek word is not always strictly an exceptive particle; and has quoted some passages in support of his remark. Still, as it is generally and properly exceptive, it would seem reasonable to understand it as so used, at least whenever this the best agrees with the tendency of the discourse: Which is the case in the present instance; there being



pronounced to be of the number; to sever him from them even in the passage brought for the purpose, it must receive an interpretation resting on the supposition of there being something understood; which, however, is not required to make out the sense. This, with the something to be understood, seems neither more nor less than as if it had been said— “In regard to the blessedness just now spoken of, consisting of the doing of what I have enjoined, I do not consider it as a subject in which all





should fall; that when he spoke in chapter 17 his purpose in their behalf, except as to one of them, had prevailed; and that what he said in chapter 18 was in pursuance of the same design; which is so expressly declared, in the last mentioned place, to have been directed to the safety of their persons, that it seems impossible to bend it to any other subject. Thus, from the comparing of the quotation as it stands in the New Testament, with its station in the Old, there arises a confirmation of the sense which is here thought

to be obvious on the very face of the passage—that our Lord acknowledged Judas to be one of the chosen, but declared, that although chosen, he would be a traitor.

The contrary interpretation to that here sustained, has been thought countenanced by what is said in Matthew 24:24 of false Christs, and false prophets, who shall deceive, if it were possible, the very elect. But who knows not, that the words, "if it were possible," are often used to express a matter of considerable





counsels of God; and of his foreknowledge of all the events, which were to be brought about in the order of his providence: such as that in Isaiah 46:10— "My counsel shall stand, and I will do all my pleasure:" that in Daniel, 4:35—"He doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth;" and that in Prov. 19:21—"The counsel of the Lord, that shall stand." In the New Testament also it is said - "He worketh all things after the counsel of his own will;" *[Eph. 1:11]* and "Known unto God are

all his works, from the beginning of the world."

[*Acts 15:18*] Many other passages might be mentioned, to the same effect; but they avail nothing, in contrariety to those who acknowledge the sovereignty and the foreknowledge of God, in their extent. What they demand, is scriptural authority to show, that his foreknowledge is exercised or his sovereignty illustrated, in the predetermination contemplated by the subject. Is it not evident in the producing of such

passages, that the doctrine is first presumed; and then proof given, of the unchangeableness of the event to which it refers?

There is another class of texts, which speak of wicked men, and of God's making of their wickedness the medium of their destruction:

The Calvinistick interpretation of which is predicated on the supposition, that God makes them wicked, with a view to that unhappy end; although no intimation to such an effect is given in the texts themselves. Thus where it is said in Joshua









surrounding nations. The words will bear either interpretation; and therefore, if there were nothing else to hinder, ought not to be applied to any sense repugnant to correct ideas of the Godhead. The latter interpretation is much countenanced by the Hebrew word [*HEB. WORD*] which is expressive of one thing answering to another.

What great stress Calvin laid on this text, may be seen book 3 chapter 23 section 6. He notices an objection made by some to

























productive, from the circumstance of its having been sown, “in an honest and good heart?” And why is the doing of good or of evil spoken of in St. John 3:20, 21, as being preparatory to the coming to the light, or the contrary? Also in Mark 10:21, we read of a young man of whom it is said — “Jesus beholding him, loved him.” And in Acts 17:11, the Jews of Berea are commended above those of Thessalonica, in that the former “received the word with all readiness of mind.” These passages are cited











Matthew says —At that time Jesus answered and said: I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight.”

[11:25] That the words, “wise and prudent,” are here used in a sense implying censure, and the word “babes” in a sense of approbation, is not denied by any. Under the one therefore, there must be conveyed the sense of a mental preparation for the















[Although this text has been stated as not applying to the matter at issue; yet it is conceived, that the words admit of a material emendation, from the Syriack version which is “[GREEK WORDS].” Of this, the present writer presumes to propose the following translation— “At which [stone] they stumble, who are disobedient to the word; to which [word] they also were set [or placed or appointed.]” If an objection should be founded on the neuter gender of the pronoun,







*which they were laid."*

*In Griesbach's text of the New Testament, the sentiment here given is sustained, by his connecting of "[GREEK WORDS]" not with "[GREEK WORDS]" but with "[GREEK WORDS]".*

*In the sentiment here considered as offensive, the reading kept in view is the vulgate; of which, however, it is a hard construction. The vulgate is - "Iis qui offendunt verbo, nec credunt in quod et positi sunt." The being appointed to the word seems a more*





















meaning of the word. It is, “before written;” and in its connexion may properly be translated, “of whom it was before written.” It must mean, either that the end of such ungodly men might be seen, foretold in prophecy; or that their destruction might be traced, either by themselves or by others, in the ends of former ungodly men on record. Nothing can be further from the sense of the passage, than that their being ungodly was part of the ordainment. The last of the two interpretations, is that given by Dr. Doddridge,













temporal promise, if it had not been quoted by St. Paul in his epistle to the Romans, and there thought to have a reference to everlasting happiness. The passage has been already noticed in the first department of the present work. But as this was merely because of its relation to the argument of St. Paul, there may be propriety in noticing it here also. The word translated: “I will be gracious,” means strictly: “I will seize or take possession;” and although thought to be applicable to benignity, according to the



modern use has very much applied the word; and hence the facility with which, as it stands in Exodus and in the epistle to the Romans, there is drawn from it a meaning apparently not in contemplation in either place.

Much also has been built on Deuteronomy 29:4. “The Lord hath not given you a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, until this day.” Now nothing could have been more foreign to the design of Moses, in a discourse which is a mixture of

exhortation and reproof, than to have told the Israelites, that their past blindness or disobedience had been owing to a withholding of the grace of God. The more natural sense, therefore, is, that the root of the deficiency was in themselves. But in truth the text, without the least violence, may be made to bear a sense the very reverse of that translation. The sense alluded to arises from making the words an interrogation, as in 2. Kings 5:26 — “Went not mine heart with thee?” &c Other places might be mentioned,









The theory here opposed, continually applying personally what was meant collectively, does not disdain to lay stress on what is said in Matthew 15:13—“Every plant, which my heavenly Father hath not planted, shall be rooted up.” The Greek word signifies not so properly a single plant, as a collection of plants; that is, a garden or plantation. The accusation had been made by our Saviour just before, concerning the Pharisees, that they “taught for doctrines





distinctly appear, as this learned man presumes. A register, however, is in contemplation; such as a general may keep of his army, or a pastor of his flock. In neither of these, does the subject either discard all dependence on the will of the person whose name is entered, or preclude all possibility of its being erased, in consequence of his default. There is always hazard run, in building doctrine on metaphor: But when this is attempted, there should be consistency.

So many texts of scripture









which gave occasion to the present discussion: There has been presumed to have been taught in scripture, a doctrine of predestination, relative to the future condition of individuals. The matter contested between the opposite parties has been, whether the decree were founded on prescience of good and ill. And what were the consequences in the confiscation of property, and in the banishment of persons, besides all the wrath and the malice excited, with their deplorable effects in a



mankind, for the express purpose of illustrating his mercy in the salvation of some, and his justice in the damnation of others. But the latter represent the same great Being, contemplating the creation and the fall together; and founding his decrees on his designs in respect to both those descriptions of persons, although without respect to good and evil to be done by them respectively. These are not yet the only airy castles of predestinarian controversy. For it has been thought of moment to inquire, and to



the human on his account. It would be endless to mention the subordinate controversies, which have arisen on the various branches of the more general controversy. But let it be asked—Does it not follow from such speculations, running so far ahead of any guidance found in scripture, that they are evidence of a frailty of the human heart, which calls for subjection to Christian humility and a just knowledge of ourselves? If it were only “weaving the spider’s web,” it would at the best be







forbidden by the nature of the subject.

It is another reasonable rule resulting, that if a man will speculate and form a system without demonstrable principles to support it, although perhaps with principles which may appear demonstrable to himself, he should at least take care, that his system be not such as leads to conclusions, directly contrary to the clearest dictates of the understandings of mankind; and especially, in what relates to the adorable perfections of the Godhead.

There are some truths, which, fairly presented to the mind, are perceived by the most simple of its operations. There are other truths, or what seem such, each of which, to be attained to, requires a chain of thought. In proportion to the number of links in the chain, we ought to be aware, that error may have happened. But if the result be the contradicting of important truths of the description before stated, it ought in reason, as is here conceived, to be rejected. The application of these









affirmed, that the words apply strictly to the subject: For the obtruding of dogmas extraneous to the written word, is not of the same grade of assumed power, as would be the incorporating of them with the word itself. We have reason, indeed, of devout acknowledgment in the circumstance, that the end designed in the interdicting of the adding to or the detracting from the Bible, in the passage to which there has been here a reference, has been accomplished by the good providence of God; in his

having maintained it in such integrity, that all parties agree in appealing to it as the standard, however they may differ in the interpretation of it. But if to demand to human opinions the same authority as to holy writ, be not actually a corruption of it, does it not partake of the same spirit, and does not the criminality of the one extend in a measure to the other? This would seem to be the case; and the consequent responsibility ought to put us on our guard.

As to the effect which the











promise.

The other sense of predestination is, as marking out from eternity some to everlasting happiness, and others to everlasting misery. But it has been endeavoured to be shown, that of this, either as founded on rescience or as independent on it, the scriptures are silent.

If so, the subject rests on reason, and our natural sense of propriety: And on this ground, what can be more offensive, than the sustaining of the sovereignty of God in such a manner, as is contrary to

































knowledge of God, who imagines that such things are worthy of him."

Let it then be remembered, how freely such writers can pronounce, concerning what the moral attributes of God require, when the argument does not invade their theory. For in such a case, there is no likening of it to the "thing formed saying to him that formed it: Why hast thou made me thus:" And there is allowed no weight to the demand that might be made on them by their opponents — "Hath not the potter power







the ends of the moral government of God, to remember, that "clouds and darkness are round about him;" yet we may answer to all theories, contradicting the primary truths gathered by sober reason from the contemplation of his works, that "Righteousness and judgment are the habitation of his seat."

## 2. OF REDEMPTION.

*Import of the  
Term—Arminian side  
adopted—Texts expressive  
of Universality—Of the  
same, without mentioning  
Sacrifice for Sin—Texts of  
Invitation—Of  
expostulation—Of  
Promise and  
Threatening—Making  
especial Mention of the  
World—Which excite to  
the Imitation of  
God—Expressive of being  
within the Covenant—Of  
temporal Mercies—Of  
Spiritual—The whole*

*applied.*

FROM a subject, which the word of God has not cleared of the clouds and darkness thrown on it by the circumstances of our condition, the attention is now invited to another; that of a truth, as luminous as the region from which it has descended to bless mankind.

The very name of the history of Redemption—the Gospel, that is, Good News—carries with it a confutation of all theories, erected on the foundation of the doctrine of a





of the hearers, were incapacitated for the acceptance of it; and that the call, although made on every individual, in such a manner as implies him to be personally contemplated, was nevertheless, with there being a circumstance understood, the existence or the want of which would render the call effectual or the contrary? These are the very matters affirmed to have been taught by the Apostles, to persons in the circumstances here supposed; who, however, do not appear to have



















“denying the Lord that bought them,” [2Pet. 2:1] and yet, “bringing on themselves swift destruction.”

These teachers had been characterized as “false,” and as “bringing in damnable heresies;”, and “destruction” is the fruit of their doings.” Of this text, as in several other instances, Dr. Doddridge gives an interpretation, amounting to that of those who dissent from him in his system.

It is but fair, to record the usual interpretation of Calvinistick writers, of the

texts which have been cited. According to them, by “all the world” and “all men,” is meant a select number from all the people of the world, of different times, places and circumstances of condition. And they who are said to have been bought by the Lord, and yet to have perished, have the former affirmed of them, because they bore the appearance to others of being of the number of the faithful. The former of these interpretations is applied to other texts, intended to be cited.

There is a very explicit passage in Titus 2:11, to which the grammatical construction gives a much stronger sense, than that found in the text of the common translation, although the margin has done justice to the original. The exact order of Greek words dictates the following order to the English — “There has appeared the grace of God, bringing salvation unto all men.” The advocates of the opposite system, so far as is known to him who writes, have no way of rendering the text conformable to



























[GREEK] not servator [Saviour] but conservator [preserver.] And he has taken a similar liberty with another passage, that of Hebrews x. 38, which is here mentioned, not as applying to the present subdivision of the subject, but as associated with the other texts by Dr. Campbell. In Hebrews 10:38, Beza translates. [*"my soul shall have no pleasure in him "non est gracum animo meo."*] "It is not agreeable to my mind." What makes the license of Beza the more striking, is the position in

which his translation stands, with the Greek on the one hand and the Vulgate on the other, in collateral columns, testifying against the incorrectness of their companion.

Dr. Campbell, in his dissertations prefixed to his translation of the gospels, [*Diss. 10. p. 5*] although himself a Calvinist, severely censures Beza, on account of the above and other incorrect translations; calling him, what Jerom had called Aquila — “contentiosus interpres;” that is, a translator who











of its being said, like those already quoted, to have been copied into modern translations of the bibles of Calvinistick churches.

*It is [Acts 14:23] [GREEK WORDS] – in English, “when they had ordained them elders;” which, to favor popular election, he has translated:*

“*Quumque suffragia presbyteros;*” *ipsi per creassent that is, when they had made presbyters by holding up hands* [significative of choice] Dr. Campbell says—“*Though no man is more an enemy of*





revealed, offer life and death; the former, no otherwise to be had, than through his subsequent redemption. Thus, when Moses admonished the children of Israel—“Behold, I set before you this day a blessing and a curse: a blessing, if ye obey the commandments of the Lord your God; and a curse, if ye will not obey the commandments of the Lord your God, but turn aside out of the way which I command you this day;” *[Deut. 11:26]* it ought not to be supposed of the Divine Being—it ought not to be



















performed.

There has been mentioned a class of texts, which unequivocally affirm the universality of the mediatorial relation to mankind. But there may be made a distinct class, of such as affirm indeed the same universality, but make it more pointed, by an especial mention of the world: which must, in reason, be interpreted of the whole and not a part of it. Thus, we read of a “propitiation for the sins of the whole world:” *[1 John 2:2]* of “the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin









save sinners: I am of that description: he therefore died to save me: and how then shall I escape if I neglect so great salvation?" But on the contrary system, it would seem that he cannot be required to believe what may not be true. The thing, if true, is so only on the condition of his being of the number of the elect. Accordingly the requisition, as applied to him, cannot be more than of faith, with the reservation of his being within the terms. And if he should be beyond them, it is difficult to conceive, how











chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people." It would be easy to multiply such evidences of the honour, with which the church hath been adorned by her divine head; and that not only about the time of her establishment, but many ages before, by the mouths of the prophets, when in vision they contemplated her with a holy rapture. That she should be like a field, in which the wheat should be encumbered with the tares; and like a net, enclosing fishes good and bad; is indeed revealed in



“Christ gave himself for it, that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing;” seems one of the most manifest incongruities, with which the divine word can be impeached. Not only ecclesiastical privileges, but temporal mercies are to the point pleaded for: that is, what are usually considered as temporal mercies, if they ought indeed to be esteemed such; if there is to be held a debt of gratitude due on their account; and if they are not a dole, dealt out to aggravate

damnation. We are told, indeed, that the mercy of God is “over all his works;” that “he does good to the unthankful and the evil;” and that he gives to men “rain from heaven and fruitful seasons, filling their hearts with food and gladness;” to the end “that they might seek after him and find him.” And many are the delightful strains, both in the Old Testament and in the New, inviting to join in the chorus of gratitude, which all nature should be continually sending up to her almighty Lord. But if the damnation









*purpose of rendering them inexcusable. According to this, there is no exception from the general observation.]*

of God to suppose, that he would thus put forth his holy energy, without intending to complete its work, unless resisted by the person to be benefitted? It is said, that all mankind incurred damnation, by the sin of Adam: May not then the object of the divine decree be supposed to have been accomplished, by a breach of the alleged covenant of works, without





them: offered in a saving sense, and under the possibility of acceptance.

It ought not to be said of inquiries, such as those above recorded, that, to make them, is to arraign the wisdom of the moral government of God; which we can never sufficiently revere, or speak of with too much caution. The object is to show, that the matter contended for, on the other side, cannot be any part of the dispensation. It is no more than is done by the Calvinists themselves, when falling in with the design of their argument;

as was shown in the passages quoted from Turretine and Witsius under the former point. There they were found saying, that God cannot condemn an innocent creature to eternal torments. It was then remarked, that their doctrine was true; and that it extended further than to the subject to which it was applied by them. But the liberty is here taken of going further; and of saying, that the gracious Being spoken of, had he given over sinners to hopeless misery, would not







instruction, coming from venerated pastors and parents, has much opposing sentiment to subdue; and that in persons piously disposed, before entire acquiescence in the truth of what is taught. Perhaps it will be said, that this is the resistance of corrupt nature, against the sovereignty of divine grace. Or perhaps, it will be called the presumptuous prying of human understanding, where reason should submit and faith govern. The latter is the very argument of the Romanists, against the

intrusion of reason into the merits of their doctrine of transubstantiation. And there are surely some truths, as clearly perceived by the understanding, as others are by the senses. But admitting either or both of the objections stated; is it possible, that the language of holy writ should be so little accommodated to its awful contents, as to designate “some” under the denomination of “all” and a “few” under that of “the whole world?” and that it should hold out a revealed will, in contrariety to a









perfections. When we listen to him saying—“Give me thine heart;” let not there be wanting a ground of the exacted tribute of affection. When he says—“If I be a father, where is mine honour;” let there be found in us such a conviction of paternal right, as shall make the motive operative. And when we read, that he will finally “judge the world in righteousness;” let us conceive of this attribute, as also governing in the preparatory dispensation of the gospel. Yes, great Creator and Preserver! Thou hast told us, that thou



### 3. OF FREEWILL

*Doctrine of Imputation and a Covenant — Radical Corruption of Nature — Texts — Oneness of the Church in all ages — What Christ said of Infants — View of the Apostasy — Consequences of opposite Theory — Objections guarded against.*

*[There may be propriety in again mentioning what was said under this point, in the first department of the work, on the term*



and the absolute need of the interposition of Divine Grace for the accomplishing of the effect. The latter are the imputation of the sin of Adam to his posterity; and the entire and radical corruption of human nature. It must be notorious, that these subjects have entered into the controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians; although, in the synod of Dort, as the latter had clearly affirmed man's natural impotency, and as this was among the tenets of the former also, no











stands in the 24th chapter of Exodus, when Moses sprinkled the blood and said—"Behold, the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you."

That these covenants were not only for Abraham and the Israelites respectively, but for their posterities also, is certain; and it is especially declared in the former instance by the rite of circumcision, which was the sign of the covenant in the flesh; not only in the person of Abraham, but in his seed after him. This covenant, however, peculiar

privileges; and the consequence of disobedience, merely as in contrariety to the covenant, was the loss of these; to which the Israelites had no more natural right than others: For as to any penalty in another life, it was such a fruit of disobedience, as would attach to it without consent on the part of the offender.

There can be no reasoning from transactions of the kind here spoken of, to the covenant in question; in which there is supposed a forfeiture of everlasting life,



have been all the felicity which might have been allotted to him, but the effect of pure grace—of the same grace, which had brought himself, and all the fair creation surrounding him, into being?

Where is the record—where is the hint given of this covenant? The writer of this could never find a single text alleged to the effect; unless by applying to it what is said of the covenant in the law of Moses. This indeed has been introduced, with a view to the subject; and allusion has been made to









must be a hard strain, that should give the words an apparent bearing on the subject. The passage stands in the translation thus — “They, like men, have transgressed the covenant.” That the translation, “men,” is justified by common use of the original word, will not be denied: And therefore, to translate it “Adam,” in the present instance, merely to suit the supposed fact, would be a circular sort of reasoning, that only shows the difficulty of obtaining scripture for the purpose. But, even supposing Adam









human interpretation into the form of a covenant, it is natural to demand the authority for such a procedure. And when it is with the view to raise from it a theory, that is to have an influence on every branch of theological inquiry; it becomes a matter of immense moment, to set off satisfactorily from the beginning point.

But with the supposed character of Adam and the covenant, there is another principle connected; of which no evidence, so far as the writer of this knows, is









would approve. The professor intends an addition to his argument, by going on to remark, that no descendant of Adam can assuredly know, whether, in the same circumstances, he would not have done the same. "Dost thou," says this author, "most iniquitous censurer of the ways of the Lord, boast thou wouldest have better used thy freewill? Nay, on the contrary, all thy actions cry aloud, that thou approvest, that thou art highly pleased with, and always takest example from "that deed of thy first parent, about









from so great a burthen; and if they believe it to have been removed from them, to be for ever grateful for the benefit. Above all, the great duty of repentance should have respect to it: For although it seems difficult to conceive of one man's repenting for the sin of another, yet, if that of Adam have been made ours by the act of God, it must needs come within the design of all those precepts, by which we are commanded to repent.

2dly. It represents St. Paul as an insufficient reasoner.



There is not a particle of record to this effect. Let the matter be supposed designed of the universality of mortality through Adam; and then the Apostle presumes nothing, but what would be admitted by every Jew; and the reasoning founded on such conceded fact, is pertinent and conclusive.

3dly. The interpretation intended to support the opinion, leads to consequences not admitted by its advocates; and therefore avails them nothing. The extent of the benefit by Christ, is

evidently affirmed to equal, and even to surpass, as is thought generally, that of the loss through Adam. But this can be true, only on the supposition of mortality as the loss, and of the contrary as the benefit. The words alluded to are in the 18th and 19th verses.

4thly. The same opinion educes from the passage a sense too far wide as well of reason as of fact, to be owned by either side. For when it is said—"Death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's



very strong expression used, that of reigning over them. There is no getting over this difficulty, but by supposing the word death to undergo an entire change of meaning, between the 12th verse and the 14th. And here let it be noted by the way, that, in the intermediate verse, the only passage brought from scripture to prove the imputation of the sin of Adam to his posterity, the word imputation is used as expressive of the charging of the guilt of the sins of men upon themselves; while there is no











by the former; and have been accordingly considered in this place.

In the passage already quoted from Calvin, in which he says— “Infants themselves, as they bring their condemnation into the world with them, are rendered obnoxious to punishment by their own sinfulness, not by the sinfulness of another;” he adds a sentiment, be the weight of it what it may, applying to inherent depravity; which is a matter distinct from imputation. The parts of the passage which are thought the most









otherwise. He urges — and is supported by the Septuagint, that the Greek word sometimes signifies “a sacrifice for sin.” Yet it is applied in a stronger way here; although by a figure, founded on that idea. In the passage, believers are called, not merely “righteous,” but “the righteousness of God in Christ.” Accordingly, to complete the contrast, Christ must be considered (figuratively) as not merely “a sinner,” but “sin.”

The same author supposes an insipid tautology in the

interpretation; it being, as he states, in effect to say — “So death passed upon all, through whom all die.” But the two clauses are not the same; the latter clause expressing not simply death; but this, in alliance with the medium by which it came. He further objects, that there being an acknowledged punishment of the posterity of Adam for his sin, they must be adjudged to have sinned in him; since punishment, without sin, would be unjust. The reasoning would be good, if the new condition of the human

race were less marked by benefit, than by infliction. The former may be abridged without injustice; and even to the highest praise of the divine benignity, if the end to be accomplished should bear the impression of that attribute, as is here supposed to be the case. Now, let it be considered to what point tend all the speculations concerning a covenant of works, and the imputation of Adam's sin. It is for the purpose of accommodating the whole system of theology, to the eternal damnation of all











they appeal to human sense, in contradiction of the Roman Catholick interpretation of our Lord's words, in the institution of the Eucharist. The words, literally taken, are decisive for the opinion which Protestants reject. But they say, that this is over-ruled by the evidence of sense; and that therefore, the command should be interpreted on other grounds, contended to be reasonable in themselves, and in analogy with other passages of scripture. Let it be here remarked, what extravagance would result,

were there admitted the principle, that whatever in scripture is descriptive of man should be interpreted strictly, without reference to general fact on one hand, and to the particular purpose of the writer on the other. Thus, when Abraham describes man as being “but dust and ashes;” *[Genesis 18:27]* such a saying might prove him destitute of an immortal spirit. The same doctrine, might be deduced from what is said by the divine Being in Genesis 6:3 — “My spirit shall not always strive with man; for that he also is





God had contracted alliances with the daughters of men: meaning the posterity of righteous Seth, with that of wicked Cain, as is generally supposed. And yet, however universal the affirmation, it was not intended strictly; because Noah and his family appear, from other places, to have been exceptions from the general profligacy. The latter of the two passages affirms, what is not here denied, but on the contrary held up as an important truth, that there is a corruption of human





and cast his throne down to the ground.” For “glory” we have “brightness” in the margin; and it might have been “cleanness,” with as much propriety as there is put “a clean thing” in the place in question. The word translated “unclean” has its root in the other word; and is the contrary to it.

There is urged, to the present point, another quotation from the same book — “How then can man be justified with God? Or how can he be clean that is born of a woman?” *[Job 25:4]* Moral purity, as pertaining to man, is not





opinions which he delivers. In the speeches of the three friends of Job, there is certainly much brilliant and instructive sentiment: They are however reproved for having uttered some rash opinions, before the conclusion of the book.

What shall be said of Psalm 51:5— “Behold, I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me.” The answer is — Let it be acknowledged, and not without deep sensibility of the danger of our condition on this account, that our earliest recollection may show us, how continually











been thought pertinent to the present subject. There can be no doubt of the wickedness, to which the heart of every man is liable: And if we were to doubt that guilty passion may wear deceitful appearances to the man who cherishes it in his bosom, we might be put to shame by the importance with which even the heathen sages have clothed the precept — “Know thyself.” But that this passage has in view the hearts of all men, may well be questioned. Not long before, there are denounced, by the mouth













these terms should be thought explained by Colossians 1:21. where it is added — “By wicked works:” which shows, that something distinct from the condition of birth is the matter intended. But those names, as they occur in the epistles of St. Paul, cannot be understood, without regard had to the difference of the state of the Gentiles, from that of the Jews; and the Apostle’s identifying of himself with the former, as their Apostle. Perhaps, the most remarkable instance of the two principles in connexion, is in the epistle







remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called the circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

Then the Apostle goes on to state the uniting of the Jews and the Gentiles in the same dispensation of the Gospel; which is the sentiment set out with—the



therefore, ye are no more strangers and foreigners, but fellow citizens with the saints, and of the household of God.” [v19]

It would seem, that there is here drawn a marked distinction of character between the Gentiles and the Jews, before their respective reception of the Gospel. The former were “the children of wrath even as others:” not as all others, but as the Roman Gentiles, from among whom the epistle was written. These converts had been, collectively speaking, in the condition described above.



the above, clearly marking the distinction between the state of the Gentiles and that of the Jews; there are other passages in the writings of St. Paul, which cannot be understood, without a reference to the same distinction. The places here meant, are such as speak of extreme dissoluteness of manners in professors of Christianity, before their conversion. One place will be sufficient for a specimen; and it shall be Titus 3:3. “For we ourselves also were foolish, disobedient, deceived,



have lived in all good conscience before God, unto this day.” *[Acts 23:1]*

It is true, that in the epistle to Titus, he speaks in the first person plural: but this is only another instance, in which he takes occasion to identify himself with the Gentile Christians, and to speak as if he were one of them. The truth is, the words in question were intended of a collective body; and, independently on being inapplicable to natural condition strictly speaking, cannot be supposed to have applied to every individual in practice.

The sense of them is sufficiently supported by the fact, that idolatry, with all its attendant licentiousness, had very much abounded among the converts from heathenism to Christianity. The same Apostle, indeed, in his epistle to the Romans, charges the Jewish community with the like corruption in practice, as that of the heathen. . Still, when we descend from the collective capacity to the individual, the Jew was distinguished from the heathen in this, that the former was owned of the

















translation—"That ye may not do." The contrariety just before affirmed is considered as tending to this effect; instead of the Apostle's being represented as establishing it by inference. But besides, the idea of the applicability of the passage to the Christian state is guarded against, both in the verse going before and in that following. "This I say then" (so begins the Apostle) "walk in the spirit; and ye shall not fulfil the lusts of the flesh." Then comes in the contrariety of principles, in the passage





those like it, there has been thought a considerable resemblance in others, which suppose an intimate connexion between sin and human nature, under the denomination of “flesh.” The being “born of the flesh,” is put in opposition to the being “born of the spirit;” and the being “carnal,” is mentioned as the same with being “sold under sin.” It cannot be denied, that the use of the words is often such as has been stated, and that sinful practice is then the same as the being “sold under sin.” But is it not also



people, he calls them “carnal,” because of prevailing attachments of different persons to their respective favorite ministers. Now, although this merited apostolick censure and correction; yet, being addressed to them who were “sanctified in Christ Jesus,” it must have been compatible with a measure of grace determining the Christian character, although under manifest imperfection. Otherwise, the Apostle addresses them in terms not applicable to them. Besides which, lamentable

















lost to them, and they have inherited from him a diseased nature.

Immortality can be regained by them only by Christ, who “hath abolished death and brought life and immortality to light.” Their nature is sanctified by the possession of grace bestowed in baptism: a grace which if improved, is sufficient for the exigencies of future life; and therefore sufficient to prepare them for early death. Let it be remembered, that only the infants of Christian parents are spoken of, because of their case only, the



diverse from the present. The Socinian doctrine is here alluded to; which supposes that Adam would have died, had he not sinned; that his death has no effect on the condition of his posterity; that there was no original righteousness in paradise; and that there is no moral pollution inherent to man at present. These, and the like opinions, are not the sense of the author of this work; and therefore he finds himself under no obligation of noticing objections, which have no bearing on the one,

although applicable to the other. He cannot however leave this part of the subject, without noticing a distinguishing characteristick of the scriptures; and some express passages in them, which seem to him in hostility with a view of human nature, exhibited by Calvinism.

It is generally believed by Christians, that the church now on earth is the continuation of a body essentially the same, from the promise of a Redeemer in paradise, to the consummation of his work























as much negative  
harmlessness, as the  
human infant; and yet it  
would hardly have been  
thought in point, to have  
made the former the  
medium of the instruction.

The other passage is in  
the 19th chapter, verse 14,  
—“Suffer little children,  
and forbid them not, to  
come unto me; for of such  
is the kingdom of heaven.”  
In St. Mark 10:15, it is  
added — “Whosoever shall  
not receive the kingdom of  
God as a little child, he  
shall not enter therein.”  
The Christian church in  
general, considers the







seem no pertinency in what our Saviour says — "Out of the mouth of babes and sucklings thou hast perfected praise." *[Matt. 21:16]* These words, as they stand in the Psalm, if not to be construed strictly, imply, that even infants may acceptably express the praises of the Creator. As the same words are applied by Christ to children celebrating his entry into the temple, the argument is probably from a less to a greater; and signifies, that if infants, in a very strict meaning of the word, may take on their tongues songs

















misstatement alluded to is  
guarded against by  
professor Turretine —

**“If it be only so, that the sin  
of Adam is said to be  
imputed to us mediately,  
because we are  
constituted guilty by God  
and are made obnoxious to  
punishment, because of  
the hereditary corruption  
which we draw from Adam;  
there will not be properly  
any imputation of the sin of  
Adam, but only of an  
inherent stain \*\*\*\*. We  
teach, that the actual sin of  
Adam is so in itself**

imputed to all descending from him in the ordinary way, that, because of it, all are reckoned guilty, and all may be punished, or at least may be accounted worthy of punishment."

*[Locus 9. sect. 35]*

Of the remaining particular—derived corruption—the author will deliver his sentiments; such, as he conceives to have been gathered by him from scripture. Man, in his innocence, was so far from being under a covenant of works, that it was a



have been made perpetual.

Adam fell; and by this event he incurred responsibility to the threatening—“Dying thou shalt die;” that is, “have thy being extinguished by a return to the earth, out of which it was created.” The same was incurred for his posterity, if any were to proceed from him: for it cannot be gathered from the narrative, whether death might not have been made to do its work more agreeably to the letter of the threatening, had not the new dispensation of a Restorer intervened.











it may be distinctly traced, concise as is the narrative. Mortality involved in itself liability to every disease, to every species of violence, and to every privation, by which the effect might be accomplished. That the elements also underwent a change, appears in the superinduced necessity of clothing; which, although in the first instance supplied by an extraordinary interposition of the great Creator, was to be afterwards the product of human industry. Added to these, there was the curse of sterility on the













common systems of  
ethicks, is divided into our  
duty to God, and our duty  
to our neighbour:  
comprehending, under  
either or both, whatever  
relates to the proper  
government of ourselves.

In regard to God, he who  
writes never knew an  
instance, in which, there  
being proposed to the mind  
of a young person, the idea  
of such a being, with the  
perfections usually  
ascribed to him, the result  
was hatred; or even  
anything short of  
admiration and esteem.  
There have been so many

instances within his observation, of its proving a theme dwelt on with delight, that he is warranted in believing it a general trait of the youthful character; although the contrary may sometimes happen; to be accounted for by an extraordinary association of ideas; the effect either of mistake in education, or the neglect of it. That the young mind may afterwards become indisposed to the contemplation of the same adorable Being; and may even become so far depraved, as never to think

of him but with disgust; and for ought here known with hatred, although not met with in any instance, is conceded. But this may be traced to the prevalence of inordinate desire, in some shape or in another; which prompts the consciousness, that the great Creator and Preserver cannot be thought of, without self-reproach.

We also owe to God, the proper government of ourselves, Now, it will not be denied, that all passions to the contrary are desires, innocent and useful as implanted in the















interference with the acquiring or the retaining of what is made desirable, by real or imaginary wants, that men cherish feelings so inimical to others and so tormenting to themselves. And uniting with such a series of unsocial passions, there is the misdirection of that noble ardour of the mind, which was given to excite it to laudable and useful enterprise. For although one end of this endowment is esteem; yet, combining with ignoble principles of conduct, it defeats its own end, by deeds which deserve















fain murder such another, who is a competitor with him in the road to publick honour — That other man must needs be desirous of making his own, the property of a certain orphan committed to his care — And that other, were he to follow as his inclination leads, would be abandoned to lewdness of every kind. Such are the men, and such is the wickedness of their hearts; and such would be their outrages, were they not kept within bounds, by considerations which represent the temporal







some languid desires after it: others go farther, and display more than common excellence, that by their majesty they may confine the vulgar to their duty. Thus God, by his providence, restrains the perverseness of our nature from breaking out into external acts, but does not purify it within." *[Book 2. chap. 3. sect. 3]*

It would be easy to cite sentiments from Calvinistick divines, to the same effect. One more however shall suffice. The learned and pious divine here in view— Bishop





doing this, they change the meaning of the latter term, which is of well-known signification in theology, expressive of a sound truth; that of the grace of God going before, us in all good, and disposing to it. The expression, “restraining grace,” may also be correctly used, although not in the sense here alluded to. That the holy spirit of God, by suggesting salutary sentiment to the mind, may keep a man back from an action which he wickedly wills to do, may be conceived of. This however is not the thing, which the



















































is enmity against God;" and that "to be carnally minded is death." Not only so, the being in such a state poisons every performance, which might in itself be the subject of divine approbation. The sense entertained on this point, shall be illustrated by reference to a passage in Dr. Witherspoon's fourteenth lecture; in regard to which, the liberty is here taken of thinking the Doctor correct in part, but not entirely. He represents his theory as "by no means asserting, that every act" (of the

















## 4 OF GRACE.

*The Arminian side taken--Texts declaring the general Tenor of the Christian Mission-Texts which make the Offer general-- Texts which suppose the Possibility of Resistance-- Texts on the other Side-- Would prove the Influence of Satan irresistible-- Unnecessary Consequence drawn by Calvinists - Consequences of the other Side-- The question of Faith and Works-- Distinction absolute and*



with an energy that is sovereign and irresistible. The Arminian knows of no saving grace, besides that given to all; which he considers as persuasive and to be resisted.

On the present point, the Arminian does not fail to remark, and he is in no danger of contradiction—that the more obvious sense of scripture is with him: its contents being generally spoken of, as interesting alike to all. And he argues from this, that if, in contrariety to offers explicitly made, and which











given, it is alleged on the other side, ineffectually. Thus, when to the call in the 14th chapter of St. Luke, there were excuses made; of one, that he had "bought a farm and must needs go and see it;" of another, that he had bought five yokes of oxen and must go to prove them;" and of another, that he had "married a wife, and therefore could not come;" they are all of them considered as bidden by the Master: as bidden, not, for anything appearing, under a determination that the offer shall be of no avail.









sealing was not, and what it was. It was not the sealing of an individual for salvation, as a merchant seals a package of goods, for the use to which it is destined— the comparison made on the other side. This could not be, since the sealing is a matter distinct from the believing and subsequent to it. It amounts to the same thing, whether we content ourselves with the common translation; or render the words, as we may— “ye, believing, were sealed, &c.” What the sealing was, appears in the expression—











Father of Lights;" that in 1 Corinthians 4:7— "Who maketh thee to differ from another? And what hast thou that thou didst not receive?" And to go from grace generally, to the most prominent fruit of it—"By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. *[Ephesians 2:8]* In regard to all such passages, the answer is, that no question is raised, as to who is the author of all good. The difference is, as to the manner in which it is bestowed by him. It would be improper, however, to





mechanical process, than the being a workmanship? And yet, to call so, a collective body of Christians, was no more than had been said relative to the community of the Jews, in many places, as in Isaiah 43:1.— “Thus saith the Lord that created thee, O Jacob, and he that formed thee, O Israel.” The polity of each was a divine work; and nothing further is contained in the expression; although it ought to be confessed equally the work of God; whenever the hearts of his people are such as he is









individually but  
collectively. The other  
point of view, is as exacting  
renovation of the heart. But  
there must be repeated a  
remark before made, on the  
impropriety of giving to  
scriptural metaphor an  
interpretation, that implies  
a production of new  
powers; while it is  
notorious, that the best of  
saints carry with them out  
of the world no other  
faculty, and no other  
capacity of any kind, than  
such as had been in it; the  
difference between a state  
of sin, and that of grace,  
being in the objects to

which the powers are directed.

The texts alluded to, are thought to derive great weight from those of another description, in which we are said to be “dead in trespasses and sins;” *[Eph. 2:1]* in analogy with which we are called on—“Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.” *[v. 14]*. Does not this very passage show the danger of building doctrine on a strict adherence to the letter of metaphorical discourse? The same persons are asleep in one







seen no beneficial effects; and on the contrary much evil to himself, resulting from it; and this had thrown him into despondency. Hence his complaint, in the words in question; the sense of which is, that God had prevailed on him, against his will, to go on his hitherto fruitless errand. The words were surely reprehensible; and still more so were the words immediately preceding them—“Thou hast deceived me and I was deceived.” The case was this. When the command had been













are adduced, as applicable to the present point, the passages which speak of mighty operations of the Holy Spirit; clearly appearing, from the connexion, to be intended of a miraculous agency, discernible by sense. Thus when it is said—“According to the working of his mighty power;” [Eph. 1:9] the same power is immediately afterwards described, as illustrating itself in the resurrection of Christ: So when we read—“He that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the





believe one irresistible, any more than the other. And yet it is to be supposed, that no intelligent Christian conceives of this, as applicable to the enemy of all goodness.

Although, therefore, it is a divine truth, and ever to be kept in view, both for caution and for consolation, that there is an influence of the Spirit of God on the hearts of men; yet it is to be considered of as suasive, and not over-ruling and irresistible. The contrary hypothesis supposes a man a mere machine; and prevents his













*freeness of grace, the preacher certainly understood that property of it, which is called irresistible.]*

The Calvinist is sensible of the pressure of the difficulty above referred to; but adheres to his system, because of a double difficulty of another nature; that of limiting the sovereign grace of God, and of administering fuel to the flame of human arrogance and pride. But how do those consequences follow? The question is not concerning what sovereign













to a man; or in him, in knowing himself superior to a brute. But how important a discrimination between man and man, is made by the doctrine of an especial grace! That some know themselves to have been laid hold on by this powerful energy, is supposed by the system. It would seem, then, that these have a right to contemplate themselves as a distinct order of beings; And if so, considering the passions of the human heart, what great temptation are they under, to an abuse of the











of passion, but constituted a part of the religion of the people here referred to. It will not be rash to affirm, that something like this in principle, is to be discerned within the bounds of civil communities denominated Christian. This is remarked under full knowledge, that it is not always an accompaniment of the theory here opposed; but merely to incite the serious mind to the inquiry, whether, wherever the contrary is found, it be not from an association of Christian benevolence with a gloomy principle; which









publick documents of their churches; and who ought, at proper times, to forget as much as possible one of the doctrines, in order to profit by the other. The resemblance between the subject and the exoterick and the esoterick doctrines of the ancients, is much stronger in the sentiments of some Calvinistick divines, than in those of others. Of this a remarkable instance may be noticed, in the conduct of the English divines at the Synod of Dort; who recommended to the States and to the deputies of that







all persons, after they have attained to the exercise of reason. In the whole New Testament, the word “conversion” is used but once; and it is where [*Acts 15:3*] report of the conversion of the Gentiles is made to the church of Jerusalem. The word “convert,” as a substantive in either number, and the same word, as a verb, in any of its moods and tenses, appears in four passages only.

*[This is to be understood exclusively of the quoting of *Isaiah 6:10*. The*

















churches, which restrict the benefit to elect infants. It is probable, that Calvin held the damnation of all unbaptized infants; because it is the professed opinion of Austin, whom Calvin follows in almost all things included in the general controversy. It is very certain, however, that many Calvinistick divines unequivocally declare their belief of the salvation of all infants. But whether they be some or all, it is difficult to perceive how they could have undergone the necessary conversion. These divines uniformly



the opinion here contradicted, we have no scriptural warrant for even the hope of the salvation of a single infant. On the contrary, the analogy of faith would lead to the belief of the damnation of all the infants which have been born, or even conceived, from the beginning of the life of Adam. Although we might probably bring ourselves to believe with Austin, who holds the above opinion with the exception of baptized infants, and others in covenant with God before the Christian













evidence of a state of grace, distinct from that which consists in the constant and progressive work, of putting “off the old man, which is corrupt according to the deceitful lusts;” and of putting “on the new man, which, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.”

In the former part of this work, there was noticed, as engrafted on the present branch of the controversy, another concerning the comparative value of faith and works. It was there shown, that the pretended merit which St. Paul attacks





















































law made nothing perfect; but the bringing in of a better hope did;” yet, even while the law lasted, intimations of the better hope to come were conspicuous appendages of the institution.

## 5. OF PERSEVERANCE.

*Dissent from the Calvinistick Doctrine—The contrary is conformable to the human Character—Passages from the Old Testament—From the New—Exhortations and Dissuasives—Passages*



point: a doctrine, of which it will not be rash to affirm, although the proof will not be here brought, that it was absolutely unknown in the church, until after the beginning of the Reformation. In the preceding part of this work, the epistle to the Romans was thought silent as to anything in favor of the doctrine, or contrary to it. In what is to follow, the latter will be upheld as gospel truth.

Let it be remarked, that this is one of the last subjects, on which, what is here conceived to be truth,





chapter— “When a righteous man turneth away from his righteousness, and committeth iniquity, and dieth in them; for his iniquity that he hath done shall he die.” That is, say some, if such an apostasy could happen, the effect would follow. The supposition, it seems, is merely made: but let it be asked— For what purpose made, in the case in question? There is also introduced the old and arbitrary distinction between a secret will and the revealed. The passage is









spoken of those, "who for awhile believe, and in time of temptation fall away." Yes— it is replied to this— because "they have no root" in themselves, The term "root" is a mere figure, expressing permanency. This, it is true, they had not; and it is the very matter opposed to the doctrine; because they believed and yet fell away. But it is rejoined, that the faith was historical and not saving. Any authorities may be got rid of, by thus creating distinctions, concerning which there is not a word in scripture.



shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and at an hour when he is not aware; and will cut him in sunder, and will appoint him his portion with the unbelievers.” The margin, instead of “cut him in sunder,” has, “cut him off;” that is, separate him from the body of the faithful: which is equally agreeable to the original, and exhibits” a better sense. Here is Christian character on one hand; and fall — final fall, on the other. St. John 15:6. “If a man abide not in me, he is cast forth as a branch, and is withered;

and men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.” Here is first pronounced a union of the believer with Christ, as a branch with its proper vine. The branch was before described, both as drawing nourishment and as bearing fruit: which is a contradiction of the usual evasion, that the severed branch represents a person who is merely of the visible church, without being of the invisible communion of the faithful. No; he comes under one of the strongest descriptions in scripture, of a spiritual membership of

Christ: yet, as the text shows, he may be at last like a branch withered, gathered, cast into the fire, and burnt.

Romans 14:15. “Destroy not him with thy meat, for whom Christ died.” The matter here guarded against, is the undue use of Christian liberty: but why should it be restrained, if the apprehended consequence were such as could not happen? The place is contradictory to the point of limited redemption; but it is equally so, of this of final perseverance: for the











there be any ground for the subtlety of an historical faith, it cannot be alleged here; because not consistent with the state, from which there is supposed a possibility of departing. Dr. Doddridge has so far a leaning to his system, as that, instead of bringing back the term, “ye stand,” to a conformity with the original, he goes still farther from it, by the paraphrase — “Ye maybe said to stand;” and he supposes of the latter part of the words of the passage, that the Greek favors their being construed into the





are people of whom he says in chapter 4 verse 6—“Because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.”

St. Paul, in his first epistle to the Thessalonians, [3:5] informs them thus—“When I could no longer forbear, I sent to know your faith, lest by some means the tempter have tempted you, and our labor be in vain.” Now, let there be considered the character of the people, to whom the apostle writes thus. In the beginning of the epistle, he remembers



of the gospel: but if they apply, as Calvinists commonly suppose, in part to the work of the Holy Ghost on the mind, their application will be the stronger on that account. In either case, there is much to the purpose in what follows— “And ye became followers of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Ghost; so that ye were ensamples to all that believe, in Macedonia and Achaia.” Such were the saints, of whom St. Paul acknowledges

apprehensions — which however had become removed —lest his labor among them had been in vain— Would an inspired Apostle have intimated such a danger, if it had been impossible? Or would any Calvinist divine of the present day intimate, that such a danger remained to those who were possessed of the tokens of election, here ascribed to the Thessalonian Christians?

Constructed on a similar principle with that in the passage the last referred to, but disclosing the sentiment more largely, is a

passage in the epistle to the Hebrews, in the third and fourth chapters, beginning at the eighth Verse of the former. Here, the disobedient Israelites are said to have hardened their hearts in the wilderness; and on this ground is founded the lesson to the Hebrew Christians— “Take heed, brethren, lest there be in any of you an evil heart of unbelief, in departing from the living God.” *[Chap. 3. verse 12]* And as, relatively to those Israelites, there had been made and kept the divine oath— “They shall not enter



and suffered for it. And the most alarming considerations which he brings before them, are found in two passages, which speak decisively to the present purpose; although it must be confessed, that there is in each of them a difficulty, on which the question is not dependent. The first of the passages, is in chap. 6:4, 5, 6— “It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of

God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance."

The other passage is as follows— "If we sin wilfully, after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries."

*[Chap. 10. verse 26]*

To distinguish the case of the Hebrews from any ordinary measure of delinquency, it has been justly remarked, that



their eyes. Superadded to this, there is evidently implied a very considerable measure of the experience of the consolations of Christian hope. And then, in regard to the expression in the tenth chapter—“There remaineth no more sacrifice for sin;” it is well remarked, that the words simply express there being no other sacrifice, than that which has been rejected: but whether it may or may not be possible, to revert by repentance to that rejected sacrifice, is a point on which nothing is either affirmed or denied.





























election sure; that is stable or firm; which is the sense of the original word. Their election is acknowledged; but there is required, that it should be rendered permanent. And how was this to be done? It is declared in the very passage; and was, by adding [*Verses 5, 6, 7.*] “to faith, virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity.” These are the very

matters referred to by the illative particle, in the verse under consideration. In the Alexandrine and other manuscripts, the true meaning is further identified, by its being added to the injunction—“Make your calling and election sure”—“by good works.” The Apostle had addressed his epistle “to them that have obtained like precious faith” with himself. If a fall from grace be impossible, how could that faith have been made more sure, by good works? St. John says, in his second epistle, verse 8—“Look to









whom he may devour." Is this personage to be supposed uninformed on a point, judged to be unequivocally declared in scripture? Or if informed, is he so lavish of unavailing efforts, as to waste any on those, in whom he discerns evidence of being within the good shepherd's pale; and whom, if he should entice them from it for a while, he must restore? This is not consistent with his subtlety, as described to us.

The plan of this work requires, that attention be now paid to the scriptural







conditions; which must always be supposed to be performed by one of the parties, in order to make the promises of the other party binding. Besides, such texts relate to the Jews as a nation, and cannot be applied individually, unless in the way of analogy.

3. The conditional promises furnish a sufficient answer to the next description of texts, advanced by Turretine, and reciting promises, as in Deuteronomy 31:8, and Hebrews 13:5. The latter of





with it. On some such ground as this, Cardinal Cajetan argued with Luther, for a fund of supererogatory works: and some have thought it injurious to the same merits, that even the sins of the elect, lived and died in, should interpose to hinder their salvation, purchased for them by so great a price.

5. From the union of the faithful with Christ, expressed Romans 8:38 and 1. Corinthians 6:17. The former was considered in the first department of this work; and the latter says— “He that is joined

unto the Lord is one spirit.” But from present union, the impossibility of future separation cannot be inferred. Else, how was Adam deprived of his early glory? And how happened it, that “the angels kept not their first estate?”

6. From the efficacy of the intercession of the Redeemer, expressed John 11:42, and Luke 22:32. The former says— “I knew that thou hearest me always;” and the latter— “I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.” The sense of these texts is satisfied, by their being supposed to







or eternal, in John 5:24—6:40, and 1 John 5:13. The first says— “He that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation; but is passed from death unto life.” These passages are expressive of the certainty of the love of God; but by no means prove, that it may not be disappointed of its object, by the inconstancy of man. A beneficent father might make very ample declarations, to assure his children of his unalterable affection, and of its





“incorruptible seed.” [1 Pet. 1:23] Yes, the seed is incorruptible, but the soil may prove barren. But to return to the passage: it ought to be interpreted by the purpose of the writer; which was simply, as the connexion shows, to affirm the indissoluble alliance subsisting between the Christian character and a holy life and conversation. If we must still listen to metaphor, brought in support of doctrine, it should be remembered, that he who is born, although he lives and acts, may die, The meaning can







saints, without remarking the dangerous aspect which it wears, in relation to sinful security and even licentious living. That it has had this effect in many instances, is so well attested, that the fact will hardly be denied; although it will be remarked, that the persons in question were never, as they supposed themselves, in grace. Yet, to all appearance, they had been under the same convictions of conscience; and had been favored with the assurances thought to be possessed by those, who have been faithful to the



different descriptions of people, if the theory here advocated be true, had no interest “in the kingdom of Christ and of God,” during the seasons of their respective delinquency. Their former convictions and sensibilities may or may not have returned; but their only intermediate effect, was the aggravation of sin.

It is here acknowledged, that gracious truths ought not to be suppressed, merely because the wicked abuse them to their destruction. But it ought to be acknowledged on the



# CONCLUSION.

*The Subject should be excluded from Theology—Transactions in the Synod of Dort—Dean Hall's Sermon—Dr. Priestley's Acknowledgment—Late Introduction of Calvinism.*

THE author hopes he has made it appear, that the subordinate parts of the Calvinistick system, instead of being founded on scripture, are the result of the opinion on the first and leading point; all the rest being accommodated to















of their position, to the very passages of scripture, which their adversaries had appealed to for the contrary; and when these had been accused by them, for many years preceding, of contradicting scripture in their discourses; and of filling them with matter, not merely foreign to it and unedifying, but having a tendency to puzzle and to disturb; it is not to be wondered at, that they were continually stepping aside from the path marked out to them. The Synod have been much blamed on this account, by some; but, as is







them, and if the election of them were with a view to their condition in another life, the like applies to the rejection of Ishmael and of Esau, whose damnation must be equally considered, as coming within the limits of the decree. The same must be preeminently true of the case of Pharaoh; whose damnation there is the less pretence for representing to be merely the result of the election of another. The whole tenor of the epistle to the Romans, on the Calvinistick plan of interpretation, represents









of all sorts of men, what is said in the 31st article of his church, which defines—“The offering of Christ once made,” to be “that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual.”

This article appears, indeed, to have occasioned some embarrassment to the English divines; and to have produced a correspondence with their superiors at home. It was probably from a similar inducement, that they exhorted the body to great moderation on the fifth

point; which is, indeed, in direct contrariety to the doctrine of the church of England, of baptismal regeneration. And even in regard to the first point, they advised, that the doctrine of predestination should not be indiscriminately handled.

Although the author has vindicated the Synod and their president, in a single matter; yet he would not be understood, as extending the vindication generally. The intemperate ebullitions of his passions were such, as it would be difficult to find any persons of the





rested their cause on the affirmative of the second question. The negative on the first, on the fourth, and on the fifth, would have been obvious inferences; with which they might have been satisfied, without affirming any doctrine of their own on the first point; but showing, that the predestination spoken of in scripture related to another subject.

There having been introduced an allusion to the Arminian cause in the Synod of Dort, it was impossible to overlook what was found so much to

the purpose of the preceding distinction between Christian faith and philosophical speculation, in dean (afterwards bishop) Hall's sermon at the opening of that assembly. The author had entertained the design of extracting the part of the dean's discourse, which applies: but as the same sentiments are more compressed in a tract of the same excellent person called “*Via media*,” it is judged, that the extract may with equal propriety be made from that.

*[The historian, Brandt,*







servitude, let him be taught the difference between matters of faith and scholastick disquisitions. Those have God for their author; these, the brains of men. Those are contained in the scriptures, either in express terms or by irrefragable consequences; these are only deduced thence by such crooked inferences, as cannot command assent. Those are for the pulpit; these for the schools. In those, the heart is tied to believe; the tongue must be free to speak. In these, the heart may be free, the tongue

may be bound." What makes the preceding passage pertinent to the present purpose, is, its cautioning against the handling of certain doctrines, as had been done by others, on principles which have been compared in this work to the exoterick and isotorick doctrines of the ancients: the truth of the doctrines being dependent on reasonings, which originate in philosophy; and are therefore foreign to the Christian revelation.

Of that new philosophy by which the Calvinistick











# APPENDIX No. 1: OF PHILOSOPHICAL NECESSITY.

*Consciousness opposed to Necessity— Dr. Clarke's Distinction between the Mind and a Balance— Consequences of supposing the Mind acted on as a Lever— Objection of Confusion— Necessity overthrows Praise and Blame— Lord Kaims— Bishop Berkeley— David Hume— Restrictions on Speculation— Danger of extending necessity to God— Mr. Leibnitz— Dr.*

THE author of this work, in the department of it immediately preceding, has had occasion to refer to important changes made in the Calvinistick theory, by its availing of itself of the aid of what is said to be the more modern doctrine of philosophical necessity. It has been matter of surprise to him, that no Calvinist of the old school, so far as is here known, stepped forward, in the beginning, to forbid the banns of this unnatural marriage. This













determined by a principle inherent to itself. This sentiment may be illustrated by the following passage from Dr. Clarke, in his controversy with Mr. Leibnitz: “There is no similitude between a balance being moved by weights or impulse; and a mind moving itself, or acting upon a view of certain motives. The former is entirely passive; which is absolute necessity: The other not only is acted upon, but acts; which is the essence of liberty. The motive is something extrinsic to the mind. The















any difference between the man and the weight, except that the former is conscious and the latter not so, of the course in which he is propelled. But let us inquire, whether this be consistent with what we know of the effect of motive on act. A man is standing at a certain place, without inducement to move from it, until tempted by some gratification at a given distance, on the right; and by another, in all respects equal, on the left. According to the theory, he would remain unmoveable; although ever so much

pressed by inclination, to the enjoyment of one or the other. To vary the hypothesis, let the offers be supposed made from stations not exactly to the right and the left, but from angles at an equal degree from right and left respectively. In this case, the man would move in an intermediate line, always keeping himself at an equal distance from the equal objects of his choice; and never possessing himself of either.

It has been remarked, that the arguments for the theory are deduced from





The answer is, that doubtless this would be the effect, if these wayward wills were let loose, without the superintendence of a divine will, over-ruling them to its purposes, by means of the connexion between cause and effect impressed on matter: it being doubtless within the contemplation of the providence of God, what effect the self-determining mind of man would have on nature, in every event which would occur. This may be illustrated, by the improvement usually made of that passage in the



*And binding Nature  
fast in fate,  
Left free the human  
will.”*

But are there no difficulties attendant on the necessarian scheme? There are many and great; of which the most prominent shall be stated.

It overthrows the foundation of moral praise and blame. If a man should have done you some substantial service, and an opportunity of a return should offer; however you may comply with the dictates of your











the beholder. It is not so, in the other department; in which the system may be consistent with pleasure on one hand, or with disgust on the other; but not with the sense either of virtue or of vice.

There is a still more important difficulty, in the connexion of the subject with responsibility. Under the operation of the theory, a man may be sensible of misery, but surely cannot be conscious of guilt. At least, if he accuse himself of the latter, it must be, by putting of the former for a time out of his mind. This,





To him who writes this it is well known, that many an ingenuous Calvinist would confess the pressure of the difficulties mentioned; but would say, that in the Arminian scheme, he finds difficulties still more pressing. Ought he not then to give a willing ear to considerations intended to evince, that both the schemes are unsupported by the gospel; so far as they speculate on the eternity of God, or connect his sovereignty and human agency together? That “there are secret things belonging to the













after him came David Hume; who, from the opposite principle of irreligion, but proceeding on the same theory, struck at the root of all certainty, on religious and moral subjects; representing man as a mere bundle of ideas, brought together in accidental association. Dr. Beattie, in speaking of Mr. Hume's representation of human nature, has noticed the compliment paid to Shakespeare — that another order of intelligent beings, without converse with man, might form a conception of him from the

writings of the poet: and then the doctor asks, whether the same or anything like it can be affirmed, of Mr. Hume's professed delineation of the nature of the same being; which is indeed wide of any knowledge to be acquired of it, from conversation with one another. Such theories may be ingenious; but without considering whether we are able to confute them, it is rational to pronounce, that they cannot be true.

If philosophical necessity be judged by this standard, there seems nothing which









among the heathen, the fatalists considered the gods themselves as subject to the decrees of fate. This is mythology; but the principles wrapt up in it, were the result of deep thought. The system was consistent: and it is to be feared, that some religious necessarians have adopted it, without perceiving the consequences in which it ends.

The late Dr. Priestley, in his tract on philosophical necessity, seems to have avoided looking on the subject, in the point of view in which it may be thought

to intrench on the freedom of the divine mind. He has, indeed, treated of this, in relation to his opinion of materialism; with which he certainly combined the kindred opinion of necessity. But how far the subject affects the freedom of the divine operation, he has not there inquired. If the writer of this were to reason, according to his own ideas of propriety, from the premises of others; he would be led to the position, that the necessarian scheme must extend to the Deity himself Dr. Priestley, indeed,



overlooked. But, whatever may have been the opinions of the ancient philosophers, we have too many evidences among the modern, that the mixture of necessity and materialism, advocated by Dr. Priestley, has a tendency to the more sublimated philosophy of that kind, denominated from Spinoza.

President Edwards seems to have been less shy than Dr. Priestley, of the bearing of his principles on the present subject. He has spoken of it in this point of view, in the seventh and eighth sections of the

fourth part of his Inquiry. In the seventh, he argues that the operations of the divine mind are not the less free, because they are and must be always directed to ends of the most consummate wisdom: and he quotes Dr. Clarke to the same effect. In the eighth section, he treats of that which is the main point, the choice of the divine mind, in an alternative, in which either side would be consistent with supreme wisdom. Here he throws on those who differ from him, the burthen of the proof, that any such alternative





might be placed in various other points of view: and the application to it of the system of necessity seems to exact a demonstration, that all nature could have been no other, than as we see it. President Edwards, particularly, takes up the position of Leibnitz, of the impossibility of there being two particles of matter alike. In discussing this point, he goes into many very minute distinctions; which it is less to the present purpose to examine, than to remark, that they imply the application of necessity in

this extent; and that therefore, there results the importance of every man's seriously considering, before he adopts the sentiment and other sentiments akin to it, how exactly it coincides with the ancient doctrine of fate, exercising sovereignty over the gods; and even how little distant it is from the modern doctrine of Spinoza, who had no other idea of God, than as an energy arising out of the organization and the operations of matter. The mutual relation of these things, was certainly not







the divine wisdom must be possessed by the man who supposes, that God has subjected the species to the influence of certain principles; and made them conducive to publick and private happiness, by a salutary deception; but has not screened the falsehood from the discerning eyes of the philosophick few! We approve and disapprove of actions of ourselves and others, on grounds of a moral nature; and not at all connected with, or rather in contrariety to any notions, which the theory of necessity suggests. That we



















which president Edwards supposes, of a man whose injurious conduct should proceed from a haughty and malicious disposition; although we should the more reprobate his character on that account; yet we should not think of it, as giving the more cause of blame and punishment. The reason why we should conceive of any blame to lie, or of any punishment to be deserved, is, that the party is possessed of counteracting principles; by which, but for his own delinquency, his evil propensities might have











ascribing the combining of philosophical necessity with Calvinism to president Edwards; it is a singular coincidence of circumstances, that while he was employed in this work, a gentleman, who, to all appearance was an unbeliever in Christianity, was aiming a blow at it under the cover of that necessity; and afterwards called in the treatise of president Edwards to his assistance. This is a consideration, which tends to confirm the sentiment here sustained, of the unsuitableness of the





although the appeal is still made “to the law and to the testimony,” there is not so much confidence in their aid, as when these were thought the only ground, which there was occasion to have recourse to.

## **APPENDIX No 2: An Analysis of the Rev. Jonathan Edwards's Interpretation of the last ten Verses, in the fifth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans**

*[See vol. 6. of the 1st. Am. Ed. of his works, p. 352,*

*et seq.]*

*General remarks on Man's  
Ruin and Redemption—  
President Edwards's  
Remarks on the 13th and  
14th Verses— His Answers  
to Objections— Faults  
found by him with two  
dissenting Ministers—  
Instance of his  
Consistency.*

The interpretation here referred to, is in president Edwards's Treatise of Original Sin. The book had never been seen by the author of the present work, until after his finishing of

the part to which this is an appendix. The treatise on original sin, like that of the same writer on freewill, is here thought to manifest strong marks of his metaphysical and acute mind. A very great proportion of the book being directed against the Socinian principles of Dr. Taylor, to whose book on the same subject it is an answer, has no bearing on the present work. And of what may be considered as applying, it is here supposed, that no occasion is given for a reconsideration of the





character of president Edwards appears conspicuous. For instead of making the frequent distinction of actions formally good, yet not so in regard to the want of the true governing principle, he represents all the thoughts and the desires of man, as in themselves essentially unholy and mischievous. Thus

[*Page 335, vol. 6. 1st Amer. Edition of his works*]

of Romans 3:10—18, quoted from the fourteenth











from. But these are matters, which will be more fully opened in what follows. The disquisition of president Edwards is divided into two parts.

## SECTION I.

Here are eight remarks of president Edwards on the interpretation to which he objects.

The first, turns on the meaning of the word “death.” That the original and obvious meaning is a termination of life, is not denied by him. And that it receives a more extended









immortality in Adam, and the regaining of it in Christ. President Edwards's second remark, has no influence on the system here sustained; however it may apply to that which he opposes. It was a point with the latter, to deny that the sin of Adam affected any besides himself. In refutation, president Edwards pertinently says, that on such a ground, it was nothing to the purpose in the apostle to state, that "by one man sin entered into the world;" because the object was to show, not how it began in a single

instance, but how it got abroad and abounded. Alike foreign to the present argument, is his third remark — that on the principles opposed to his, the force of the causal particles “through” and “by” is done away. It is so; unless in the sin of Adam there be seen a causality, in reference to the mortality of his whole posterity. It may also be said of the fourth, that it treats of something foreign to the present object. The remark is in opposition to a position of Dr. Taylor, that the entailment of mortality







between Adam and Moses, had incurred the death inflicted for Adam's sin on all. These were points, which the aim of the apostle's argument made no call on him to prove; and he refers to them as acknowledged principles; in order to show, what he had especially in view, that, the death of Christ was for all, both Jews and Gentiles. President Edwards treats the passage, as if the apostle were endeavouring to prove, what he is here supposed to have presumed: and therefore, the charge of

inconsequential reasoning does not lie against the sense here contended for, however it may have lain against that of Dr. Taylor. For the same reason, there is nothing to the present purpose, however pertinent it may have been in answer to the same gentleman, in all president Edwards has said concerning the right of God to inflict death, as the punishment of breaches of the law of nature. There is no doubt of this; although Jews and Christians must believe, that it was actually inflicted for the breach of positive law. And this fact

might reasonably be— not proved, but — appealed to by St. Paul, because of its subserviency to a matter beyond it in his contemplation.

It is here conceived, that the interpretation given will derive an accession of strength, if, on the very respectable authority of the Alexandrian manuscript, we read “was not imputed” instead of “is not imputed;” this bearing the appearance of an abstract proposition; and the other agreeing better with a fact referred to. If the criticism be correct; the latter part of

the verse should be rendered — “there being no law.”

The sixth remark may be considered as confined to the peculiarities of Dr. Taylor’s scheme; and to argue well, that there could be no grace in redemption, which yet the passage is acknowledged to affirm, if there had been no penalty on the apostasy.

The seventh remark relates to the signification of the words “judgment,” “condemnation,” “justification” and “righteousness.” President Edwards’s charge of



































occupied in laying down the author's own: beginning with the scope of the epistle, as declared in the chapters preceding the chapter, of which the verses in question are a part. The first property of the epistle, supposed by president Edwards, is, its treating largely of the depravity and ruin of mankind, in their natural state. But it has been contended in the first department of this work, and is here repeated, that the natural state of man, be this what it may, is not the subject treated of in those early chapters. There are

















idea of his leading up of their attention, to sin's entering into the world by Adam, the common father of Jew and Gentile: Which, with several coincident remarks, must have been intended in contradiction of the theory, making the sin of Adam merely personal in its consequences.

From this, president Edwards goes into remarks on the 13th and 14th verses, similar to those in his first section and already attended to; and which are here preparatory to his own interpretation of the 14th —







both to Jew and Gentile, in their common parent, was sufficient to be a foundation for the analogy of their regaining of it also by a common head, who should stand in the same relation to them both. Therefore, as the words of these two verses do not express anything to the purpose to which they have been applied, so neither does their general scope, even as laid open with that intent.

What follows, in this section, is principally recapitulation, dependent for correctness on the

presumption of the truth of what had gone before; except that president Edwards, although he acknowledges some difficulty in the 13th verse and in the next which has been the last under consideration, insists, that the passage in general, is one of the plainest in scripture.

It will be allowed by all, that the difficulty lies principally in those very verses, from which, the one or the other interpretation of sin and death will have an influence on all the rest. It would further seem, that

on the one hypothesis or the other, there are modes of expression which can be accounted for no otherwise, than by the occasional and very peculiar brevity, of St. Paul: of which, if there were no other evidence, there would be sufficient in the frequent introduction of words, in this passage, not found in the original; but which the translators were under the necessity of introducing; taking care, agreeably to their usual fidelity, to express them in italicks. So that there seems no ground for the loud complaint which president





into either. The reply is, that the object is not to ascertain the one or the other; but to acquit or condemn, according to known and, humanly speaking, recorded works. Now, if eternal damnation should be understood under the term “death,” as coming on all men originally for Adam’s sin; they who are not released from that state by the mercy of God through Christ, absolutely sink under the weight of that sin. And the most remarkable application of the principle is to all

infants, except the elect.

Another objection is, from there not being a single instance in scripture, of the use of the word “impute,” in the sense supposed; although it is used in the sense of a reference to personal sin. The author opposed had said, that it is often so used; which occasions president Edwards to remark, that it is twice only. He does not, however, allege a single instance of the use of the word in the sense denied by the objection. Yet he is aware, that other words will be said to have been

























“who hath righteousness and judgment for the habitation of his seat.”

The following is a sketch of the reasoning of president Edwards, on the subject of identity. He lays down the position, which the author whom he opposes had maintained also, that we are upheld in existence by a continual divine agency. He remarks, that the existence of any created substance, at the present moment, cannot be the effect of its existence in the moment preceding. Therefore, the cause of its continuance in successive

periods is the divine constitution simply; the operation of which he argues to be accordingly equivalent to a new production out of nothing, at each successive moment. This arguing is to show, that if God annexes identity to these successive productions (or what amounts to them) out of nothing, he may with equal reason annex oneness, or identity to such a relative condition of all mankind, as resembles the root and all the branches of a tree: And if to such a collective body coexisting, to the







constitution, as stated in the illustration of the tree and its branches, it was in discharge of what was spoken of in the first part of this work, as a subject of his abhorrence — endeavours to trim off the knots of Calvinism. The notion of federal headship, had been an expedient for the reconciling of the doctrine of imputation, with the attributes of God. But the thought of a divine constitution, was more in alliance with the satisfaction felt by this author, in the contemplation of the

exercise of the sovereignty of God, in hardening and damning whom he will.

Of this treatise of president Edwards it may seem remarkable, that, although entitled to rank with his treatise on Freewill in point of ingenuity, it has not the like celebrity with the latter work, among the advocates of Calvinism. The author of the present work thinks it may be accounted for, from the consistency maintained by president Edwards, in his pursuing of his opinions into all their consequences. From these, a very great



To get rid of this, they supposed, that the first sin was not imputed to infants in the same degree, as to Adam himself. One of the divines was in hopes of providing, in this way, a retreat for the little wretches, in annihilation. The other thought himself entitled to affirm, that their condition would not be worse than non-existence. All this is much to the dissatisfaction of president Edwards; who, arguing more logically from the data held in common, rejects such softening expedients, invented for



part of the work; and which is indeed connected with the whole subject. The fact to be recorded is taken from his life, prefixed to his Treatise on Religious Affections.

President Edwards began his ministry as colleague of his maternal grandfather, in Northampton, Massachusetts. The latter, during a long residence in that place, had encouraged the members of his congregation to present themselves at the communion, provided their lives were correct; and although they might not









## PART 3

*A Comparison of the Controversy between the Calvinists and the Arminians, with the Opinions of the early Fathers.*

### INTRODUCTION.

*The Kind of Evidence to be educed from the Fathers—The early Fathers, silent on the Points denominated Calvinism—This continued, until the Time of St. Austin—Calvin acknowledges the Fact.*

THERE ought to be clearly understood the purpose, for which reference is made to an authority extraneous to holy scripture: especially as there are some, who criminate every appeal to the fathers; as if it were a removing of the cause from before the tribunal of the paramount authority of the law and the testimony. It is accordingly here declared, that no idea is entertained of going beyond the limits of the canon, for the establishing of any opinion, not found in the books of

which it is composed. But it is conceived, that the sense of the times immediately following the apostles must, as a fact, be a strong testimony on the question of what was the faith, which the apostles handed to them; and, in that point of view, may give considerable aid in the interpreting of scripture. This is no more than what is attributed to them, by the admission of their testimony, in regard to what books are to be received as the writings of the apostles. The argument, as applying to any leading doctrine or institution of

Christianity, in proof of its having been held at the time in question, appears to the writer of this equally cogent, as when applied to the genuineness of the book, in which the doctrine or the institution is supposed to be found.

But the argument appears to him even to increase in weight, when applied in the negative form; or, when it is pleaded that a certain doctrine could not have been delivered by the apostles, because not found in the remains of early times; and especially, those of them written with the















that nothing certain can be learned from their writings. For some will interpret this, as though I intended to deprive them of the right of giving their suffrages, because their opinions are all adverse to mine. But I have had no other object in view, than simply and faithfully to consult the benefit of pious minds, who, if they wait to discover the sentiments of the fathers on this subject, will fluctuate in perpetual uncertainty."

Again, speaking of the divine influence, he says—  
“And he moves the will, not





# 1. OF PREDESTINATION.

*Apostolick Fathers— Accounts of them by Mr. Toplady, Dr. Haweis, and Mr. Milner— Succeeding Fathers— The Time when Predestination, in the Philosophical Sense, was introduced— Fathers later than the above— Consequence— Change effected by St. Austin— Interposition of the Papal See— The Subject purely Metaphysical.*

ON the subject of this department, the first



















Stress is laid, on its being said that — “Christ chose his own apostles;” and that, “it was requisite that he (Christ) should suffer on the tree:” which last is construed in favor of necessity. Other authorities of the like kind are produced; but according to the interpretation given of them, scores to the same purpose might be taken out of the writings of known and professed Arminians.

When Mr. Toplady comes to the interesting epistle of St. Clement, he finds a sentiment which would be indeed to the purpose, if



literally as follows. [Clem. Ep. 1. ad. Cor. 8. Cot. ed. tom. 1. p. 152.]

“Therefore, being willing that all his beloved should be partakers of repentance, he has established” [here a pronoun is wanting: if supplied, it ought to relate to the premises] “by his own omnipotent will.” But Mr. Toplady [Page 123.] has translated the last clause — “He has established them firmly” [meaning his beloved] “by his own almighty purpose.” This makes it inapplicable to what went before; with which it is connected by the



incongruous that could have been devised.

There are other passages cited to the purpose; but so evidently foreign to it, that there can be no occasion to repeat them. Some of them apply to divine providence, and to the sovereignty of God in nature. These subjects were doubtless considered as inseparably connected with the question of predestination, in the mind of Mr. Toplady; but he must have known, that in the conceptions of others, they were distinct.

But does not St. Clement, like St. Paul, make use of

the term “elect?” He does; and like St. Paul, in a sense different from that supported by Mr. Toplady; as appears in the second section, where he tells those whom he addresses, in reference to their former laudable conduct— “There was among you, by night and day, a solicitude for the whole brotherhood: that with mercy and conscience, the number of the elect might be saved;” strongly implying, that some of the elect, meaning of the visible church, might not finally be saved.

The manner in which Dr.

















indeed cannot reasonably be supposed? According to the same writer, perseverance is contained where it is said— “The church is as firmly united to Christ, as he to the Father.” And the Calvinistick sense of the corruption of human nature opens on the mind of the interpreter, in the assertion, that “carnal men are not able to perform spiritual things.”

In commenting on the introduction of the epistle to the Philadelphians, Mr. Toplady [Page 131] considers what is said of



But this is rendered — “The spirit is not to be seduced;” and it is applied as if the meaning were — “There is no seduction of the spirits of believers.” The sense of the writer of the epistle is neither more nor less, than that he was not to be dissuaded from his purpose of meeting martyrdom.

In treating of the epistle to the Trallians, [*Page 132, sect. 11*] Mr. Toplady bends a sentence to his theory, by keeping out of view the heresy of the Gnosticks; to which, according to the connexion, it has a manifest reference. In the

twelfth section, he finds it hard to get rid of an intimation evidently against him; when the writer exhorts the church whom he was addressing, to pray for him, lest he should be found a cast-away. In referring to the epistle to the Romans, [pg. 133] there is a notorious change of the sense of a passage, in the 3d. section. The martyr says, that Christianity [as the Greek copy of Vossius has it] or a Christian, agreeably to the Latin copy of Usher, is “the work of greatness.” There is





connexion: But Archbishop Wake has followed the latin copy, in his translation of this epistle; noting in the margin, the differences of the other. The embarrassed state of the passage renders it hardly worth the pains of any man to supply it with conjectural additions, for the support of any doctrine whatsoever.

It may be to the purpose not to leave Ignatius, without taking notice of a quotation from him in Gerard Vossius, [*Lib. 2. part 1. page 159.*] in which this writer thinks he finds an authority for the





interpolated, that the sentiment alluded to is met with. It is not a little in favor of the genuine epistles, that in the two instances here alluded to, even the interpolated are thought deserving of attention, when apparently favorable to the purpose of writers, whose systems of ecclesiastical discipline naturally influenced to the rejection of both.

After Ignatius, Mr. Toplady [pg. 134] takes notice of the epistle of the church of Smyrna, relating to the martyrdom of their bishop St. Polycarp. Among





amidst an infinity of rubbish. It must be evident to every intelligent reader of this writer's works, that there could not be to his eye any golden grains, but such as he conceived to sparkle with the peculiarities of his favorite doctrines. And if he had but comprehended the apostolick fathers, under his sentence of condemnation, there would have been no need to remark on his extremely prejudiced exhibition of some passages in their writings. Dr. Haweis, however, does not hesitate

to rank the apostolick fathers “low on the scale of excellence; whether in precision of doctrine, clearness of argument, knowledge and comment of scripture, beauty of style, or forcibleness of application, compared with many of a more modern date.” [*Chap. 2. sect. 2. Cent. 1.*] As to style and some other matters, they have nothing to do in the present inquiry. There are certainly many things in the writings of these men, which speak immediately to the heart. They are principally taken up with Christian morals;

not however without a reference to their foundation in Christ's redemption. But when Dr. Haweis speaks of their want of precision of doctrine, it may fairly be inferred from the general tenor of his work, that, under the term, he contemplated an entire absence of the doctrines, which were with him the substance of Christian verity. Dr. Haweis acknowledges of Ignatius in particular, that, "in doctrine, he does not seem to have degenerated from the truth as it is in Jesus:"

A cold compliment; and of which no further proof is given, than that “the superscription of the epistle to the church of Ephesus, marks strongly the doctrines of grace.”

*[Chap. 4. Cent. 2]* That is, it has the word predestinated; but whether in the sense of the writer who makes the remark, or in that contended for in this work, is the question.

The author cannot leave this subject of the apostolick fathers, without recommending it to the serious consideration of any sincere inquirer, into







before, the full effect of “the breaking down of the partition wall;” and of “Jew and Gentile being one in Christ,” Since the work of Mr. Toplady and of Dr. Haweis, there has come into notice a production, which has excited attention in England, and has been reprinted in the United States— “A history of the Christian Church, by the Rev. Joseph Milner,” who seems to have been a clergyman of the church of England, of some celebrity. Like the two authors above-mentioned, he is a Calvinist; and although not









possessed abundance of a singular kind of charity, in supposing piety to abound in heretical and schismatical communions; even where there were no documents in his support. Not so Mr. Milner; who, on the contrary, is not sparing of his censures on people of that description.

The stating of these facts is intended principally with a relation to Mr. Toplady. If, in what appeared to him in the shape of Calvinism, in the apostolick fathers, nothing of the kind was seen by Mr. Milner, who agreed with him in







community, and to their militant state on earth.

On going beyond the apostolick fathers, it is necessary to quit Mr. Toplady; because he did not consider any beyond them as worthy of his notice. Not so Dr. Haweis; who, professing to write a history, found himself under the necessity of weighing the merits of distinguished characters, within the bounds of his narrative; if it were only to show how much, when weighed in his balance, they were wanting. This writer professes, that







rather in retirement from it. The same has happened, in regard to ecclesiastical transactions. In the record of them, we are shocked by the instances of ambition and crooked cunning which we meet with; although, doubtless, we are also gratified by opposite instances of sublime virtue. In addition to these, there was an immense mass of piety, the existence of which has been manifested in its effects; while the possessors of it have been unknown to fame.

If, in persons of the last description, Dr. Haweis









affirmed—that in those days there were some at least, who believed the doctrines now generally known under the name of Calvinism, and held up by Dr. Haweis and others, as exclusively entitled to the honourable commendation of being the doctrines of Grace.

It is then no small evidence of there having been no such theory in the early ages, that it was not found by Dr. Haweis, who set off professedly in search of it. And the author to whom the plan of the present work invites



















indeed would some be good, and others bad: For either we must resolve, that fate is the cause of evil; and that she does things contrary to herself; or, that which we have before said must be seen to be true, that virtue and vice are nothing, and that good and evil exist in opinion only; which, as true reason declares, is the highest impiety and injustice." The martyr goes on to other similar remarks; concluding the subject with affirming, that his doctrine was that of the prophetick spirit; and quoting to this

purpose Deuteronomy  
30:15—19, and Isaiah  
1:16—20.

If anyone should be disposed to deny, that there is a resemblance between the Stoical doctrines of fate, and the predestination maintained by Calvinists, it would be little to the purpose; because the reasoning of the writer goes as much to the merits of the one, as to those of the other. There shall be but one more passage brought from the same author, although many things might be copied from him to the same effect. In his















a strain of reasoning, evidently as anti-calvinistic as ever was written by Arminius or any of his followers.

There is something singular in Dr. Haweis's treatment of the character of this celebrated person. "He quits" (says Dr. Haweis) "the scriptural grounds of God's election, and grace;—and supposes all that self-sufficiency of the human intellect, and human agency, which bespeaks a man too little acquainted with his own heart." [Vol. 1. *page 190.*] Not a circumstance of this

sort appears in Ireneus; unless it be discoverable in the single instance of his sentiments, on points now comprehended under the Calvinistick controversy.

After so harsh a sentence passed on Ireneus, Dr. Haweis had a delicate task to perform. That bishop presided in the church of Lyons, when, under the persecution of the emperor Severus, the streets flowed with Christian blood. This rests on the testimony of the ancient martyrologies, and on the authority of Gregory of Tours; a writer of the sixth century, and







there was no reason to distinguish one part of it from another; especially, as Dr. Haweis allows, that the first strokes of vengeance would naturally alight on those who presided in the Christian assemblies.

There may be use, in noticing a different treatment shown to Ireneus by Mr. Milner, from that of Dr. Haweis. The latter inferred from the Arminianism of the very early father, that he was a stranger to his own heart. The former, after noticing also his Arminianism, adds— “There is not much

of pathetick, practical, or experimental religion in the work" (on the early heresies.) "The author's plan, which led him to keep up a constant attention to speculative errors, did not admit it. Yet there is everywhere so serious and grave a spirit, and now and then such displays of goodness, as show him very capable of writing what might have been singularly useful to the church in all ages." *[Vol. 1. page 262]* It has been seen, that Dr. Haweis, besides pronouncing of the same venerable person, that he













Tertullian his master. And it is a known fact, that he was never thought heterodox, any further than as relates to the latter part of his life, and to the error of Montanism into which he then fell. His admirable apology, addressed to the Roman senate, is, of itself, sufficient to render his name respectable in the Christian church. This celebrated work was written long before his fall: and if the doctrines called Calvinistick were such as pervades the whole system of revealed truth; it might be expected, that at least











these remarks takes the liberty of thinking, although with much reverence of the memory of so learned and sincere a man as Gerard Vossius, that he is not accurate in the above particular; and that the predestination of Clemens, like that of St. Paul, respects a state of covenant with God in the present life. It is however evident, that the diligent inquirer here spoken of, could find nothing in the fathers respecting the predestinated conditions of individuals in another life, whether founded on





undertake to say: but he judges Beza to be right in the opinion, that it was in or near the time of Origen, when there arose the idea of individual election, connected with the other idea of its being founded on prescience; there having been no separation between the two, until it was accomplished by Austin.

There should be particular notice taken of the period, in which a predestination, founded on prescience, and both subjects as they relate to another life, first show their

heads, in the works of Christian writers. Clemens of Alexandria has been quoted to this effect; although, as the present writer supposes, under a mistake. There is, however, a sentiment to the same effect in Ireneus, [Pg 68, *Ed. Thirlby*] a contemporary of Clemens, in a passage which was before recited. There has been also thought something to the same effect, in a passage of Justin; which, however, does not seem to the writer of this to come under the denomination treated of;

because, although Justin speaks of prescience, it is not as having a connexion with predestination. The passage alluded to, is where the martyr speaks of the delay of the destruction of the world, “until the number of the just be fulfilled; until he” (Christ) “shall have struck down the demons opposing him;” adding— “And until there shall be fulfilled the number of those who were foreknown by him, as who would be good and virtuous men.” If, however, it should be thought that the passage speaks as well of





prescience, which is here allowed to have crept into the church in the time of Origen; yet, we know not how far it may have been his opinion, or that of his translator, Rufinus, through whose hands alone we have any of the works of the other, except of his book against Celsus; and by whom great liberties with them are supposed have been taken. Besides, Origen's well known fancy of the transmigration of souls, is so connected with the present subject, that there is no knowing how far the one may have been







it is poison itself." [Vol. 1.  
page 315. Am. Ed.] And yet  
no one can deny, that the  
baptismal offices are full of  
this supposed poison. But  
why was it not very  
dangerous in the time of  
Cyprian? Was it, that all  
baptized persons were  
afterwards adorned by  
Christian rectitude? The  
contrary appears, in the  
glowing accounts which we  
have of the great  
declension, before the  
beginning of the Decian  
persecution. Of this, Mr.  
Milner himself says — "The  
long" (preceding) "peace  
and prosperity had





and from Justin. The first of these, although he finally settled in the western empire and had his bishoprick there, was a native of Asia; had his education among the Greeks; and wrote in their language: the present remains of him in latin being, as was before stated, a translation. The two others, if they are to be reckoned on the present occasion, were Greeks; in respect as well to residence, as to birth. Now, the metaphysical sense of the present question may reasonably be supposed not

to have interested the western division of the empire, whatever influence it may have had in the eastern; which however, as is here believed, was not considerable. Neither is the inattention to the subject to be wondered at. There was no longer that mixture of Judaism with Christianity, which required the opposition of the national predestination of scripture. There had not arisen the heresy of the denial of the grace of God, which was conceived as calling for the absolute predestination of St. Austin. It is true, that

intermediately to these two stages of the subject, the disposition of the Greeks to metaphysical subtleties, had led them to a conditional predestination; applying to individuals, what the scriptures had said of nations. But it required time to establish these, as prominent subjects of theological discussion.

Justice is not always done to the fathers, on the subject of mixing the dogmas of philosophy with the doctrines of the Christian religion. The practice, however finally

prevalent in the church, was begun by hereticks. There is a striking authority for this assertion in Tertullian's book — “de Prescriptionibus;” confessedly one of the ablest of his works. He ascribes all the errors of hereticks, to their being introduced into Christianity from the philosophical sects, to which the patrons of these errors were respectively addicted. An appeal thus made in the face of the world, in favor of the integrity of the church in that particular, in

Tertullian's day, is no small evidence of the fact until that time. That there was afterwards a deplorable falling off, must be acknowledged.

When we come down to the fourth century, it is natural to make a pause, and to look back on the preceding centuries, under the light furnished by the records of their transactions, as they stand in Eusebius. It is well known, that we have no other work, communicating to us so much knowledge of the times intervening between the gospel age,

and that in which he lived. The amazing successes of the heralds of the religion of Jesus, in different quarters of the globe; the persecutions brought on Christians, and the fortitude with which they sustained them; the notices of the works of Christian apologists since lost, generally giving details of the subjects of their compositions; the accounts of bishops who had filled the most populous sees, not without delineations of the most conspicuous properties of their characters; these and many



neither on the affirmative nor on the negative side of the questions, since become so famous! Of the subjects treated of by Eusebius, none gave such scope for what we have in vain looked for; or rather none so loudly called for it, had there been any thing of the kind to be recorded, as his professed design to give accounts of all hereticks, and heresies. Had predestination and its kindred points, been at all a subject of discussion, there must have been something which would have been branded as heresy by some.





lives and deaths found in the history of Eusebius, and most of all, in the Triumphs of Martyrs under torture, or in the flames, is one of the most improbable suppositions which can be made; especially when all parties in religious controversy are in the habit of appealing to the book, as a faithful narrative of the events which it professes to record. Even Dr. Haweis, although he takes notice [Vol. 1:330.] of Eusebius's being "a favorite at court," and that this was "no good sign for a bishop;" yet [lb. 329] admits him to be



from it by the learned translator of Mosheim, and it might have been still added, by many others, much higher in the estimation of the world for learning and judgment, than Dr. Haweis.

But to go on with the fathers of the fourth century: the authorities against the sense of Austin and of Calvin, are so abundant, that they have not met the resistance of the feeble attempts made by some, in relation to earlier fathers. There shall be recited a few of the authorities; not for the









believers. By which it is manifested, that the choice is not of nations, but of thew ills of men.” [Pg. 555] Thus writes St. Jerome, as zealous an adversary of Pelagius, as St. Austin himself; and yet, as Vossius remarks, treading in the steps of those who had gone before him, on the subject of the quotation given.

But it may be worthwhile, in consideration of the celebrity of this father, to attend to a few more extracts from his Works [pg. 555] He says— “According to which he















have involved in it a censure on all who had gone before him.

From Latin writers, the transition is to the Greek: and the beginning shall be with Basil, who acquired the title of “the great.” This eminent man writes as follows — *[Page 563]* “Although the apostle says, that the vessels of wrath are fitted for destruction; let us not think, that Pharaoh was made bad. For thus, the faults would be transferred to his Maker. But, when you hear of vessels, understand that every one of us is made for some use:

as in a great house, one vessel is made of gold, another of silver, another of shell, and another of wood. Therefore, the will of every one is compared to materials of this sort. For, the golden vessel is he, who is sincere and without guile in his mind and manners. The silver vessel is he, who is a little inferior to the other in dignity and value. That of shell and of clay, who is wise to earthly things, and fit to be broken and destroyed. That of wood is he, who is easily debased by sin, and affords fuel for eternal fire. So















of the latter. "[Page 552] In another place, the same father speaks thus of the same case of Jacob and Esau— “That it may appear, says he, the apostle, that the election was made according to foreknowledge.” [Page 553] And in another, place, commenting on the eleventh chapter of the epistle to the Romans, he says— “His people, whom he had before foreknown to be fit, and to be recipients of the faith.” Other passages might be cited from the voluminous works













which flourished with a denial of them? And yet among calumnies the most cruel, a charge, so reasonable as this would have been on the principles supposed, is not to be met with. Not only so, when Austin, within less than a century afterwards, broached opinions in contrariety to those of Chrysostom, it does not appear, that the recent popularity of the modern doctrine had the effect of bringing the more ancient under condemnation. The reason is obvious. The former was rendered







establishment? This is too extravagant a supposition, to be admitted; and should be precluded by the acknowledgment of Calvin, adverted to in the beginning. For it has been seen, that he charges the fathers with conceding too much, lest they should draw on themselves the ridicule of the philosophers; quoting, in another place, many passages to this effect; and saying, that he should have quoted more, had he not been restrained, by the apprehension of being accused of craftily passing















freed from the obligation of their sins.” And there is more to the same purpose.

If the Calvinistick doctrine be indeed of the essence of grace, as some suppose, it might have been expected, that when the light of truth arose at last on the mind of Austin, he would have perceived, that he had hitherto been a stranger to the free grace of God. But no: for although he taught otherwise than he had done formerly; yet he does not appear to have conceived of his new theory, that it was essential to Christian verity; as it





Austin was not altogether that, which has since been denominated from the name of Calvin. What is called the perseverance of the saints, is in direct contradiction of the former system, and it has nothing of what has been since called the covenant of works; invented for the giving of an air of justice to the imputation of Adam's sin. Even this does not appear in so offensive a shape as in the modern doctrine: for although, according to the representation of Austin, all incur eternal damnation



the modern. For although Austin held, like those who had gone before him, that without it we can do nothing; yet he represents it as acting without violence to the will. Notwithstanding all these points of difference, the sentiments of St, Austin must be confessed to be Calvinistic, in respect to the independence of predestination on works or faith foreseen.

The author finds it proper, in this place, to state what he thinks the changes which the doctrine of predestination has







century and the beginning of the fourth: which will evidently appear to those, who shall peruse the authors within those limits, with a view to the present question.

3dly. At about the period the last mentioned, some of the most distinguished writers of the Christian church, beginning to have a reference in their writings to questions agitated among the philosophers, occasionally touch on the question which relates to freewill, as it is called. [*The Liberum Arbitrium*,” of the Latins and the “GREEK” of



have been grounded.

But 4thly. At length arose St. Austin; who, in his early writings, trod in the steps of his predecessors; but having his mind afterwards irritated in his controversy with the Pelagians, conceived, that the further he removed from them, the nearer he came to the truth. This led him into the track of a discriminating predestination; which precluded a great proportion of mankind from the possibility of being saved. His great name gave a currency to his opinions; and their being



doctrines of St. Austin, was that of Pope Coelestine, his cotemporary. This prelate, after the death of the other, censured some French presbyters, who had faulted his doctrine; and the French bishops, who had let such conduct pass in silence. Coelestine drew up nine articles, under the name of Aphorisms, against the opinions opposed to those of Austin; which articles relate to grace and original sin, and say nothing of predestination.

Further, Coelestine added to his articles a declaration,

in which he alluded to some deep and perplexing difficulties, which he wished to avoid. The Roman catholick historian, Du Pin, remarks, that some supposed the deep and perplexing difficulties to be the efficacy of grace and gratuitous predestination. But the said historian, although he will not affirm that these are articles of faith, is of opinion that Coelestine lays down the first of them and supposes the other, in the Aphorism; and that therefore, under the name of deep and perplexing difficulties,

there were alluded to other matters, which are specified by the historian. And besides, as he remarks, the adversaries of Austin having principally opposed him on these two points; Coelestine, whose purpose it was to confute them, could not but maintain those doctrines.

Du Pin's opinion is confirmed by the subsequent reputation of Austin, within the see of Rome; however inconsistent this may seem, with her veneration for Chrysostom, Nazianzen, and many others. And







which the papal bull condemned, instead of hazarding the expedient of denying the authority of the bull, had recourse to that of disputing the correctness of the quotations. And, although this brought on the carpet a new question, whether the pope were infallible in fact as well as in faith; yet, in resisting the pretensions of the former, they were sure of support, not only from the parliament and the people, but also from that great number of the French clergy, who were zealous assertors of the liberties of





would cut the knot which they will never be able to untie; excluding the subject from the sacred sphere of theology, and referring it to that of metaphysical philosophy.

Among the quotations of M. Milner from St. Austin, he has brought forward the father's application of the passage in the seventh chapter to the Romans, concerning the struggle between the flesh and the spirit; which he makes descriptive of the apostle himself, before his acceptance of gospel grace. This is a construction of the











## 2. OF REDEMPTION.

*The Question not found in a controversial Form, in the Early Fathers—Passages from them—Inadmissibility of Evasion.*

IF the Fathers were anti-calvinistick, on the first point of the controversy, it may easily be presumed that they were the same, on the other four points. Accordingly, we find them such; and—that in the most decisive of all shapes, not as





















## *Magnum]*

Arnobius has never been supposed to have given any other than a true account of Christianity, in the contrast in which he has placed it with the religion of the Gentiles. This author, professedly answering the objection that all do not receive the benefit, although all are called, says — “The fountain of life is laid open to all; and no one is prohibited or driven away from the right of drinking.” *[Bock 11]*

Gregory of Nazianzum, so much celebrated as a model of Christian piety and

humidity, eloquently sets oft the sentiment here sustained, where he says—“The little currents of his” (Christ’s) “blood have restored the whole world; and is to all men, that which rennet is to milk; gathering and joining us in one. Oh great and holy passover, and atonement of the whole world!” And, to show that the expression, “the whole world,” is not used loosely and carelessly, he opposes universal redemption to what would have been partial: “Not,” says he, “of a small part of the world, nor for a little





against the Arian heresy; but surely no man's language was further removed from theirs than his must be seen to have been, in this treatise of his on the incarnation of the word; in another, in Exposition of the Faith; and in others of his numerous compositions.

The inconsistency of Dr. Haweis is especially conspicuous, in the instance of his character of Athanasius. The great leader of the opposition to the heresy of Arius might of course, on that account, look for some mercy at the

hands of the depraver of the characters of the fathers generally; not excepting those who were as inimical to the cause of Arius, as Athanasius himself. Accordingly, after many commendations of his doctrine, Dr. Haweis says — “Take him for all in all, he seems the brightest ornament of that high station, to which he had been advanced. I shall look for greater Christians in humbler life, nowhere for a more able defender of the cause of God and truth.” [1. vol. 329] After this, it is natural to look for some

little evidence of a title to such a character; or at least, some slight expression of what Dr. Haweis considers as orthodoxy, on some one of the Calvinistic points. But no instance of this is produced, from any of the numerous works of Athanasius. The truth is, that no instance of it was to be found; and not this only, but that there were to be found divers contradictions of the leading points of that theory, of which there are instances in the quotations made. The overlooking of these, is a great relaxation



and a living one for the whole world.” *[Haeres. 55]*

The author of the book entitled: “Of the Call of the Gentiles,” which, although erroneously ascribed as to the authorship, is confessedly full of true Christian doctrine, Records as follows, in book 2, chapter 16, entitled “That Christ died for all — There is no reason to doubt, that Christ died for sinners, of which number he was not himself one. Did not Christ die for all? But wherefore did Christ die for all?” And afterwards— “All, whether











could not have been."

Even Austin, before his controversy with the Pelagians, discoursing on psalm 95, speaks as follows— "The Redeemer shed his blood and purchased the world. Do you ask what he purchased? Observe what he gave, and learn from it what he purchased. The blood of Christ was the price. Of so great a price, what is the value? What but the whole world? What but all nations?"

It would be easy to swell the size of this detail to a great extent. But the author







### 3. OF FREEWILL.

*A Caution— Sundry Fathers— The Subject as it respects Original Sin.*

BEFORE we enter on this point, as it respects the fathers, it may be proper to guard against misconception. They so abound with passages ascribing all good to the grace of God, that it would be a great error to suppose them attributing anything to the will of fallen man, so as that it may be operative of good, of its own power





Again, in the dialogue after stating that it was in the power of God to have created the multitude of men at once, he goes on to show, that the divine plan took another course, thus—“ But, as he knew would be fit, he made both angels and men with freewill, to do well and justly; and he appointed the different times, according as it seemed good to him, that they should be endued with this freewill, and because, at the same time, he knew it would be good, he set forth his judgments both general









his liberty a slavery. But if of necessity he bestows on us the symbol of his death" (meaning baptism) "he does it unwillingly. But who permits that to remain, which he does contrary to his will? For do not many afterwards fall away? Is not the gift taken away from many? These are they who creep in, who having entered on the faith of penitence, build on the sand their house which is soon to fall." [Adv. *Hermogenem*] The passage is not only to the purpose for which it is produced, but is hostile to the point of







being infinitely wise, powerful, and good; but, as the creed of this heretieke pronounced, by a middle deity, between one essentially good and another essentially evil. This impious tenet would have been answered by a Calvinist, without reconciling, as is done by Tertullian, the prescience of God with the condition of man as a being, “suae potestatis,” or, who has a power over his actions. But Tertullian held nothing in common with the Calvinists, as to this point. And yet, however much



“Christ did not chide, or heavily threaten those who departed from him; but rather, turning to his apostles, he said: Will ye also go away? herein regarding the provision, by which man, left to his liberty and constituted in his own will, himself pursues for himself, either death or life.” — “The liberty of believing or not believing, placed in the will in Deuteronomy: Behold I have set before you life and death.

After such citations from the first three centuries, it must be superfluous to













but before he had written against the broachers of it. The passage is his comment on 1 John 3:3 and is as follows: “Observe, how he does not take away freewill, in saying he purifieth himself. Who purifies us, but God? But God does not purify you against your will. Therefore, because you join your will to God, you purify yourself.” The discourses on St. John’s gospel and epistle are supposed to have been written about the year 416. And it was in the 422d that St. Austin began to publish in the controversy.

Agreeably to the plan of the present work it will be here proper to consider the point in question, as it respects the doctrine of original sin.

The challenge may be confidently made, for the producing of a single passage from any writer for the first 400 years, giving the least countenance to the doctrine of the imputation of Adam's sin; in such sort, as that all mankind incurred eternal damnation on its account. The writer of this was indeed surmised, at finding the idea expressed in the

definition of original sin, in the very place in which Vossius is going on to show the consent of the fathers in that doctrine. But great was the author's surprise, at the inconsistency of this learned man; when, on examining the authorities, it appeared, that none of them go to the said point; although there are very many pertinent to the other points in his definition; which are temporal death, and the loss of original rectitude.

To search the fathers for a specifick contradiction of the comparatively modern





other points, as held by Calvinists.

Yet, the same excellent man undertakes to give their consent in the doctrine of original sin, considered as comprehending these three particulars — Privation of original righteousness, subjection to temporal death, and eternal separation from God: and under the last, there is evidently not contemplated an entire extinction of being. But the greater number of the authorities which Vossius produces, apply no further than to

temporal death; and some few of them apply to a corruption of nature; while, to the purpose of eternal separation from God, there is not a sentence. As a specimen, it is proposed to give a few of his citations, and to begin with one from Justin. This father speaks, concerning the Redeemer, to the following effect— “He did not endure to be burn and to be crucified, as if he had need of these things; but he submitted to them for the sake of the human race; which, through Adam, had fallen under death and the

seduction of the serpent: to say nothing of the proper fault of every one, acting wickedly for himself."

In this, there is surely nothing bordering on the idea of imputation, as held by Calvinists. But it should be remarked, injustice to Vossius, that, writing as he did against the Pelagian heresy, he might not have thought it incumbent on him, to take notice wherein his quoted passages did not go to all the three points mentioned by him, as included within the idea of original sin. They all made against the Pelagians, who

held that sin to be merely personal. Had Vossius written with a professed view to the matter here intended to be established, he would probably have been more guarded. And perhaps it is but just to remark further, that there does not appear what measure of punishment he considered as attached to a separation from the presence of God. He quotes Austin, as saying of infants dying unbaptized, that although they are damned, yet it “is by a damnation the lightest of all;” and he will not say, that it would have









by a virgin, it may be released by a virgin; the virginal disobedience being balanced by virginal obedience. For, the sin of the first man being amended by the correction of the only begotten; and the wisdom of the serpent being vanquished by the simplicity of the dove; we are released from the chain, by which we had become tied to death.

Another authority of Austin, and from him taken by Vossius, is that of Origen; who says— “The malediction of Adam is common to all men; and





attribute of original sin; and what he says shall be here translated, in order to show still further the difficulties in which learned and judicious men entangle themselves, when they go beyond the scriptural account of this matter, and superadd what is necessary to accommodate it to a system. After stating the first and the second particular, in which he defines original sin to consist, he says of the remaining one— “The third is the worst; partly, because it is the irreparable loss of grace and glory; partly,





agreeable to the original constitution of human nature.

There is a remarkable passage in St. Austin, in which he gives an explanation of original sin, similar to that which is sustained in this work. The passage is in his discourses on the gospel of St. John, and is as follows, being a comment on chapter 3, verse 37. "He did not say, the wrath of God shall come on him; but the wrath of God remaineth on him. All who are born, have with them the wrath of God. What wrath of God? That



For we were ourselves the children of wrath, even as others. All are the children of wrath, because coming under the curse of death."

*[Volume 9, page 29]*

This was written, like the passage the last quoted from the father, after the beginning of the Pelagians, but before his publick controversy with them. It is evident, that he considered the threatening in paradise as accomplished by mortality; although doubtless, this with all its natural effects.

## 4. OF GRACE.

*The Question stated, as it respects the Fathers—Passages from them— Of the Subject, as it regards Faith and Works.*

BEFORE an entrance on this subject, as it respects the fathers, it may be proper to ascertain, in what way we may expect the matter found in them to apply to the sentiment here sustained, supposing it to be correct.

It would be in vain to search in them for direct













of the Father to himself.” Again— “He” [that is Christ] “calls Peter happy, because flesh and blood had not revealed it to him, but his Father, who is in heaven; making it manifest, that to know the Son of the Almighty Father is not from the flesh, which was carried in the womb; but from the paternal power itself.”

Tertullian follows: In his book *de Anima*, he says— “To whom is the truth discovered, without God? To whom is God known, without Christ? To whom is Christ displayed, without

























## 5. OF PERSEVERANCE

*St. Austin did not extend his System to this Point—Sundry Fathers— A Concession of Gerard Vossius— The Opinion of Calvin, not altogether consistent with present Calvinism— Result.*

ON this subject Calvinism has the least to say, in regard to the appearance of it in any theological writer during the early ages. As to the few scraps of sentences in which an overweening zeal has supposed the



from a passage, which will be quoted under this point from Calvin. If there be any exception from the truth of this remark, it is in the instance of the controversy raised in the 9th century by Godescalius, who is thought by some, to have hit on the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints. There is indeed a difficulty in perceiving wherein this persecuted monk differed from Austin in his doctrines, except in his bold avowal of all their consequences.

As to Austin, he held perseverance to be a special







understood a feigned piety; because, just before, the faith spoken of had been defined that “which worketh by love.” And soon after, the persons spoken of had been all described as justified by faith. Again—“Why it is granted to some, that they should be taken from life in a justified state, while other justified persons are kept, by a longer life, in the same dangers until they fall from justification, who have known the design of God?”

It would be endless to quote passages to the same effect, from this celebrated

father. And it is observable, that he does not give his opinion, as if it were on a controverted point. There was indeed a controversy, as to the general necessity of grace; in which the Pelagians had argued, that if this were divinely given, it would not happen, that some should fall away from justification. That some fell away, was admitted on both sides for truth. But Austin warded off the argument by saying, that all grace was given, except the grace of perseverance. And this continued, uniformly, to be the opinion of the

church into which Austin's ascendency introduced it, until after the reformation.

The following is a remark, which Vossius makes of the fathers generally, in relation to the present subject: and the remark must seem the more worthy of notice, when it is considered as coming from a learned divine of a Calvinistick church. Speaking of the opinion opposed to the doctrine of the perseverance of the saints, he says in his 6th book under thesis 12, to this effect— That they only of his day denied the

former opinion to be the common one of the fathers, who, however learned perhaps in other respects, were strangers to antiquity. And he further says of them, that they have their minds so enslaved by the opinions of others, as rather to see with their eyes, than with their own.

The same Vossius, has referred to sundry of the fathers before Austin; and noted to the purpose, passages of their works; naming Justin, Clemens of Alexandria, Cyprian, Tertullian and others. Although the author of the













# CONCLUSION

## *Application of Authorities to the General Question of the Five Points— The Importance of this Branch of the Subject to Protestantism.*

ALTHOUGH, in the introduction, there was given a caution against the supposition, that the fathers were to be set up, as supplying what might be imagined to have been omitted in the scriptures; yet it is here again notified, that the former are cited











The fourth point, so far as it is agreed on by both parties in the controversy, is very luminous in the authors cited, and in many more which might have been cited to the purpose. They declare, that salvation is altogether of grace, and that everything holy in man is produced in him by the operation of the Holy Spirit. But when to this there is added such an irresistible energy, as makes man wholly passive in the business of his salvation, there is no document establishing the point, that such an idea had



























to the claim of the infallibility of the Roman Church; but the early period of it is peculiarly so. For there we have an instance of the change of sentiment of Christian bishops generally, within the compass of an age. The change extended also to the bishop of Rome himself, and to his church considered within its provincial bounds; the only bounds within which he was considered as acting with authority, until within a short period of the time when the change took place.

















# AN APPENDIX: Containing an Argument against Calvinism from some Circumstances attending the Introduction of it into the Church.

Design— Late Introduction of the Theory of St. Austin— Its Contrariety to the precedent Faith of the Church— He at first agreed with the early Fathers— His Innovation offended many— It appeared in a mis-shapen Form— Opposite Positions of this Father — He never censured as essentially



system generally. The argument will relate to those innovations made in theology, in the beginning of the fifth century, which have all along been held out, as the substance of the Calvinistick theory.

But there is another reason, in thus bringing into view the remarks which have been made on the changes introduced by Austin. It is, that there is thought a use in setting down from this father, some passages on one side, and some on the other, of the controversy; in order to give strength to the









noticed— Gerard Vossius. After having given quotations in his work, from page 550 to 571, he says— “Augustine, that he might the more bravely encounter Pelagius, added this appendix to the opinion which had been common to the fathers; and defended by himself, after he became a bishop — That grace is offered to one in preference to another, and is more efficacious in one than in another, comes from the absolute decree of God.” Vossius then goes on to prove what he affirms, by quotations. It is not here

known, that the assertion of this respectable writer has been assailed; although it has been long before the world, in a work of so high a reputation, as that of his history of the Pelagian controversy.

It has been noticed concerning a late writer in the controversy, Mr. Toplady, that he conceived of his having discovered, in writers antecedent to Austin, some fragments of sentences savouring of Calvinism. Probably, other such writers as Mr. Toplady might be found on inquiry. But it is here presumed,















at the sovereignty of God. This father, before the appearance of Palagius, had written three books on freewill, as unreservedly as had been done by any of the fathers, who have been quoted in this work. Being accused of this by the Pelagians, he made, answer in his retractions, that the books had been written against the Manichees, who affirmed the origin of evil to be in God. It was in contrariety to these, Austin says, that he had affirmed evil to be from the human will, without taking into view the question of the



less weight in another ground of defence, which Austin has taken in his retractions. The plea now alluded to is, that the liberty which he defended was predicated of man in his first estate, and not in his fall. This is contradicted by the whole thread of the argument, in the three books on freewill. The argument is carried on in the form of a dialogue, which connects the question with the practical subject of human conduct, in the present life. The matters here affirmed will appear in extracts from













the propagation of it was considerably damped, by the opposition in which it stood to the hitherto prevailing doctrines of the church. A similar application might be made of an event which took place in the monastery of Adrumetum; occasioning a correspondence of their abbot with St. Austin.

There is a remarkable fact, relative to one of the French clergy, to whom the opposition in Marseilles is ascribed. The person meant is Cassian, who was in the highest reputation, both as a writer, and as a man of a

very holy life and conversation. He was a contemporary of Austin. The works of Cassian are said to have been full of good sense and piety. Although they are known to have contained many things in opposition to the sentiments of St. Austin, on the subjects of predestination and freewill; yet, in defiance of the popularity of the latter, and the countenance afforded to them by the papacy, the other work continued to be admired and much read, in monasteries and elsewhere,” having



temper of the papacy at the time— it has not been congenial with the views of any Calvinistick church in any time— to bear with such deviations, from what is conceived of as the very essence of divine truth. Consciousness of novelty is the only principle, which can account for its being born with at the time referred to. Perhaps it may be objected, that there was born with the error of Cassian and others of Marseilles, consisting in what took the name of semi-pelagianism. This, although it acknowledged















seems not to have been understood by this holy man. He perpetually understands St. Paul's term, to justify, of inherent righteousness, as if it meant, sanctification. Still, he knew what faith in the Redeemer meant, and those parts of scripture, which speak of forgiveness of sins, he understands, he feels, he loves: but St. Paul's writings concerning justification he understands not sufficiently, because the precise idea of that doctrine entered not formally into his divinity." Mr. Milner

professes to have taken the above, from "The Theological Miscellany for September, 1785." another Calvinistick work of celebrity.

The writer of this proposed, in the beginning, to exhibit to the eye some instances of the contrariety in the sentiments of St. Austin himself, before and after he became engaged in his conflict with the Pelagians. But it will be proper to note the points, to which the quotations will apply. With the fifth point of the controversy — perseverance — there will

be no need to meddle; because the ancient faith, as to that particular, continued to be maintained. They who impugned his doctrine perceived and maintained, as an objection to the new theory, that the ancient was contradicted by it. Doubtless, this was a consequence fairly drawn. The present writer entertains the opinion, that Austin perceived the tendency of his theory to be hostile to the doctrine of universal redemption, descended to him along the stream of antiquity; and to

bring the subject into the shape in which it now appears, in the standards of churches confessedly Calvinistick. Certain it is, that in his controversial writings, he hesitated to pursue his principles into their consequences: so that they who affirm him to be a maintainer of universality, are obliged to call on the testimony of his friend St. Prosper; who, on slender grounds, vouches to that effect. The reserve of the father on the subject made it more easy, some centuries afterwards, to persecute Godeschale; who















the divine will, so as to hinder him from making of them what he will." In another— "This grace which is secretly given to human hearts, by the divine bounty, is by no hard heart rejected." In another— "Of two infants alike bound by original sin, why one is taken and the other left; and of two adults, why this is so called that he obeys the calling, and the other is not called, or is not so called that he obeys the calling, are the inscrutable judgments of God." And in another — "If any force us to search into







could ever have conceived the contrary to what this text affirms, in any sense in which it can be taken. But the sense in the place in which it stands, is really no more than what relates to the possession of such gifts, as ordinarily create a rivalship. The sentiment is substantially the same with what the very heathen acknowledged; of which there is a specimen in Homer, in what Agamemnon says of Achilles, without any subtle distinctions concerning divine grace and human liberty— “Know, that the





are here considered as his needless speculations in theology. The circumstance is, the fondness for speculations of that description, which he seems to have brought with him from philosophy; as will appear from the passage to be here translated from the first of his three books on freewill. The work is in the form of a dialogue: and when Evodius, who bears the other part in it, had asked concerning the origin of evil, Austin answers—“ You propose the question, which exercised me



be added, that a great proportion of his voluminous works are a comment on the confession. Do the scriptures, in any place, impose an obligation on Christians, to perplex themselves with the inquiry, which so exceedingly harassed the father in early life?

It will not be pretended that they do. Accordingly the next inquiry is — Whether it be not at least probable, that the refined reasonings, introduced by him, as little concern the ordinary Christian, as does







